



Research Article

Cold Fusion Public Policies: Realizing Benefits and Mitigating Disruptive Impacts

Thomas W. Grimshaw*

LENRGY, LLC, 3571 Far West Blvd., PMB 102, Austin, TX 78731, 512.784.1078, USA

Abstract

Cold fusion (now widely referred to as low energy nuclear reactions, LENR) has many potential energy benefits for society, but it also has risks of major disruption. Despite being rejected soon after its announcement 30 years ago, LENR has continued to be pursued by researchers worldwide. The continued vitality of the field, and substantial progress in understanding and reproducibility of the phenomenon, have challenged the initial verdict on LENR as non-legitimate science. LENR realization for the benefit of society will be enhanced by the forces of the free market. But government policy changes are needed to realize LENR benefits and deal with its anticipated disruptive impacts. Evidence-based policy making is a rational way to revisit negative policies for research support. Technology assessment is a candidate method for identifying and mitigating LENR's adverse secondary effects. Government agencies and the private sector have the opportunity with LENR to accomplish their missions. As a potential new source of abundant, low-cost, and clean energy, LENR has the possibility of substantially improving the long-term prospects of humankind.

© 2020 ISCMNS. All rights reserved. ISSN 2227-3123

Keywords: Cold fusion policy, Disruptive technology, Evidence-based policymaking, LENR policy, Rational public policies, Technology assessment

1. Introduction

Cold fusion (now widely referred to as low energy nuclear reactions, LENR) has the potential for immense benefit for society as a cheap, clean, and virtually unlimited source of energy. It would also almost certainly be a highly disruptive technology, at least in the short term, with adverse direct impacts on the existing energy infrastructure and indirect effects on associated components of society. Fortunately, policymaking procedures are available to deal with the “double-edged sword” of LENR.

Rational policies have served the public interest for centuries. Evidence-based Policymaking (EBP) is a rational way to set – or reevaluate – policies for LENR research support to realize its energy benefits. Technology Assessment (TA), a rational method of evaluating and mitigating adverse effects of new technologies on the various components

*E-mail: thomaswgrimshaw@gmail.com.

of society, may be readily applied to the LENR case. Policies for the benefit of society are essential both for realizing energy from LENR and for dealing proactively with its disruptive secondary impacts.

2. Background

The potential benefits of LENR as a new source of energy were well understood when it was announced by Martin Fleischmann and Stanley Pons in March 1989. Examples of LENR benefits are:

- Virtually unlimited energy source.
- Low cost of materials.
- Environmentally secure (no emissions or effluents).
- No harmful radiation or radioactive waste.
- Deployable in centralized or dispersed configurations.
- Energy source is available everywhere without transport or restriction.
- Reduction of energy-related environmental contamination by replacing fossil fuels.
- Decrease of carbon dioxide emissions and mitigation of global climate change.

Nagel has listed no fewer than 40 potential advantages and impacts of LENR development for thermal and electrical power [1]. In addition to its promise as an energy source, LENR may have another benefit, through elemental transmutation, of dealing with the nuclear waste problem.

2.1. New technologies and society

Governments worldwide adopt policies, laws, and regulations to protect and enhance the public interest [2,3], including policies for developing new technologies. The benefit to society from public support of research has long been recognized. This support is particularly important in the early stages of technology development when research costs may not be justified for private sector investment. Salient historical examples are the Manhattan Project, which brought World War II to an end, and the US space program, where research has yielded many benefits beyond the immediate goals of the program. The public interest is well served by rational policies and methods like EBP.

Governments also protect the public interest by addressing the disruptive impacts of new technologies. These impacts are both direct – on existing market solutions (e.g. current business) – and indirect – on sectors of society closely associated with current infrastructure (e.g. workforces, communities, local governments). These direct and indirect impacts are disruptive to both the private sector and elements of society [4].

Because the social costs of new technologies are normally not included in expenditures for their development, these costs are viewed as “market externalities”. Public policies may thus be implemented to intervene in the free market to mitigate the adverse secondary impacts and increase the overall benefit of a new technology. A premier example of such intervention is the suite of laws and regulations put in place to protect and clean up damages to the natural environment by market-driven activities such as industries. Government intervention using methods like TA is often necessary to protect the overall public interest.

The opportunity for government intervention for support of beneficial R&D not qualifying for private sector investment and for mitigating adverse secondary impacts are the result of incomplete alignment of private sector interests and the public welfare, which is referred to as “market failure” [5].

2.2. LENR policy status

Notwithstanding its potential benefits, LENR was rejected by mainstream science within a year or so after the 1989 announcement [6,7]. The processes and events that led to the rejection comprise an outstanding case for the field

of sociology of science – the social processes by which science is “done” [8,9]. The boundary work of science – determining what is accepted and what is rejected – is a major component of this sociology [10].

A principal reason that LENR continues to be rejected is the challenge it faces as a new phenomenon. Reliable reproducibility remains elusive, and hypotheses to explain it are not yet converging to an adequate explanation. Experimental observations cannot yet be interpreted in terms that are consistent with the current understanding of nuclear physics.

Unfortunately, in some cases skeptical researchers maintained that LENR does not exist because they did not observe it in their experiments; that is, not observing it means that a phenomenon is not legitimate. However, the failure up to obtain success may actually be the result of not achieving the required experimental conditions [11].

Unlike most rejected scientific claims, LENR research did not die out. Instead, investigations have continued by many researchers at locations around the world. Because of its pariah status [12,13], the field has developed a social science structure outside of mainstream science, including:

- Professional organizations. For example, International Society of Condensed Matter Nuclear Science^a, and Japan CF-Research Society^b.
- International conferences. For example, International Conferences on LENR (ICCFs)^c
- Magazines and peer-reviewed professional journals. For example, Infinite Energy^d and Journal of Condensed Matter Nuclear Science^e
- Websites and blogs^f. For example, Cold Fusion Now!^g and New Energy Times^h.

Public policy for support of LENR generally followed the scientific rejection of the field, and public resources became very scarce. And, of course, no policies were pursued for dealing with its secondary impacts. Whether the rejection of LENR was a “proper” instance in the sociology of science, or if the public interest has been served by negative research support policies for the past 30 years, seems now to be almost a moot point. Particularly given the demonstrated vitality of the field and the progress that has occurred, the time has come to reconsider these negative policies. In consideration of the public health benefits of a locally available source of heat for cooking and water purification, a strong case can also be made for an ethical mandate to pursue of LENR.

3. Policies for Realizing Benefits

A large gap has emerged between the promise of CF as an energy source and the policies toward its support for realization of its benefits. EBP is a rational and readily available approach for closing this gap [14].

3.1. Evidence-based policymaking for LENR

EBP has its roots in evidence-based medicine [15,16], whose success led to the method being extended to other areas such as business management [17] and public policymaking [18–20]. EBP can help to guide policy decisions when (as is often the case) the best decision is uncertain. Policymakers often do not have a technical background and may

^a<https://iscmns.org/>.

^b<http://jcfrrs.org/indexe.html>.

^c <https://iscmns.org/conferences/>.

^d<https://www.infinite-energy.com/index.html>.

^e<https://iscmns.org/publications/jcmns/>.

^f CMNS Google Group.

^g<https://coldfusionnow.org/>.

^h<http://newenergytimes.com/>

be challenged in making complicated science or technology decisions. An evidence-based way to address this issue is to translate scientific evidence into levels of evidence (LOEs) that are used in the legal field [21]. Policy responses can then be developed based on the readily understood LOE and associated probabilities [22]:

- Preponderance of evidence (>50%).
- Clear and convincing evidence (70–90%).
- Beyond a reasonable doubt (>90%).

Assignment of the LOE in the case of LENR decision-making involves uncertainty, but the process of making the assignment adds both clarity and rigor. For the LENR case, a preponderance of the evidence (POE) for LENR reality may be asserted by the research credentials and experience of Dr. Fleischmann (Fellow of the Royal Society in Britain) and Dr. Pons (chemistry department chairman), by the basic findings of their LENR experiments [23,24], and by the early confirmations by other researchers. Four examples of early experiments that confirm excess heat are described by Beaudette [25] – Richard Oriani (1990), Robert Huggins (1990), Melvin Miles (1990), and Michael McKubre (1990–1991).

Clear and convincing evidence (CCE) is indicated by the hundreds of additional confirming experiments by many reputable researchers. For example, Storms conducted a review of reports of LENR for the period 1989 to 2004 and found 319 claims of success based on three signatures of the phenomenon: excess heat (184), elemental transmutation (80), and anomalous radiation (55) [26].

CCE is also supported by Bayesian network analysis of LENR experiments. Cravens and Letts [27] conducted a review of 167 reports (1989–2007) and screened them to 122 “qualified reports” based on use of Fleischmann–Pons type electrolytic cells and several other criteria. Johnson and Melich [28] performed a Bayesian network analysis on eight of the qualified reports recommended by Cravens and Letts and found the likelihood ratio (that LENR is real) over 10. Johnson and Melich then added four more reports from the Cravens and Letts list (total of 12 reports) and found a likelihood ratio over 30.

Grimshaw, with the assistance of Johnson and Letts [29,30], conducted a Bayesian network analysis on the first 10 experiments (six of which were considered successes) listed by Cravens and Letts. The analysis assumed “starting probabilities” (pre-analysis estimated probability that LENR is real) ranging from 0.05 to 0.50. With a starting probability of 0.05, the probability of LENR reality increased to 0.59 after the first 10 experiments. A starting probability of 0.50 (50/50) led to a probability of 0.96 after the 10 experiments. Such high likelihood ratios and probabilities clearly support an LOE at the level of CCE.

CCE is further indicated by the strong interest of large and well-known private sector companies [31,32] that are currently funding the research. The development of prototype devices (e.g., Brillouin’s “Controlled Electron Capture Reaction approachⁱ and JET Energy’s NANOR and PHUSOR devices^j) that may be producing LENR energy also supports a CCE level.

It seems likely that an LOE of beyond a reasonable doubt (BRD) will have to await publication of a convincing hypothesis based on current (or extension of) understanding of nuclear physics or development of a readily reproducible experiment. Alternatively, BRD may be established upon announcement of a working LENR device such as a water heater or electric power generator.

What are the appropriate LENR policy responses to the levels of the evidence? The answer is again a matter of opinion, but consideration of two relevant scenarios again increases clarity and rigor. The following are proposed as rational responses for a conservative scenario.

ⁱ<https://brillouinenergy.com/science-technology>.

^j<http://world.std.com/~mica/jetenergy.htm>.

- POE ReinstatE LENR and pursue its development rigorously along with other emerging energy technologies.
- CCE Accelerate LENR research in comparison to competing potential energy sources.
- BRD Institute a crash program to achieve full understanding of LENR and realization of its benefits, perhaps at a level comparable to the Manhattan Project.

For a more liberal scenario and considering the immense potential benefit (and ethical mandate) of LENR, a rational policy response to POE would be to enhance its research in relation to other emerging technologies. A response to CCE (as well as BRD) would be to undertake a crash program for LENR understanding and benefits realization.

3.2. Implementation of policies for realization

EBP-based strategies for LENR research must take into account several considerations:

- Complexity of the chemistry aspects of the phenomenon.
- Accommodation of nuclear physics for LENR observations.
- Interplay of the issues of reproducibility and explanation.
- Location, status, and capabilities of experienced researchers in the field.
- Collection, interpretation, and utilization of experimental results to date.
- Research support in a centralized or dispersed manner.

The chemical conditions required for LENR constitute a large number of variables (“parameter space”) that contributes to inadequate reproducibility of the phenomenon. The inability of current understanding of nuclear physics to account for LENR observations is one of the principal reasons for its early rejection and continuing pariah status. Research strategies must address the interrelated issues of explanation and reproducibility. A satisfactory explanation would lead to improved experiments and enhanced reproducibility, and more reliable reproducibility would lead to greater understanding and development of an adequate theory.

A great deal of information, particularly experimental results, has been generated by many LENR researchers over the past 30 years and may provide a foundation for future research. Similarly, experience and insight gained on other LENR aspects, including research methods and current competing hypotheses, could be a resource for developing research plans and selecting investigators, locations, and facilities. Research strategies could involve dissemination of resources to individual researchers and labs to address various facets of the problem. Alternatively, the research may benefit from a centralized approach (or two or three major locations) to help set priorities, share results, and enhance communication.

4. Policies for Dealing with Disruptive Impacts

Proactive planning for dealing with disruptive technologies like LENR is essential for achieving their overall benefit to society.

4.1. Technology assessment for adverse secondary effects

TA is a policy analysis approach for identifying and mitigating the adverse secondary impacts and unintended consequences of beneficial new technologies on the existing infrastructure and associated elements of society [33–35]. TA was developed in about the same timeframe, generally in the 1970s and 1980s, as the major environmental laws and

regulations that were instituted to prevent future pollution and clean up past contamination [36]. Although both are examples of government intervention in the free market to protect the public interest, the scopes of TA and environmental protection are different. In TA, overall society rather than the natural environment is emphasized. And TA's focus is on the adverse impacts of innovative technologies rather than on the impacts of existing market-driven activities (such as manufacturing) on the environment. The TA generally includes the following elements [37,38]:

- Development of the TA team and advisory group.
- Statement of the problem and description of the technology.
- Identification of potential direct and indirect impacts.
- Delineation of affected entities.
- Determination of policy options for dealing with the impacts.
- Description of the policymaking infrastructure and agencies.
- Conclusions and policy recommendations.
- Implementation of selected policies.

The TA team and advisory group include both policy analysis professionals and knowledgeable persons from the entities (private sector and government) most directly involved with or impacted by LENR deployment.

4.2. Implementation of LENR mitigation policies

TA has been applied successfully for energy-related issues previously, for example for broad-based development of energy resources [39] and for coal slurry pipelines [40], and it can be readily applied to the LENR case [41]. A specific procedure based on the above steps is shown below.

4.2.1. Form project team and advisory group

Because of the broad range of energy infrastructure and social system impacts, a multidisciplinary team will be required for the TA. Participatory TA [42,43] will be emphasized, which will include both energy technology experts and policy analysis professionals. The team will perform most of the impact analysis and development of mitigation recommendations. The Advisory Group, including private sector and government representatives, will provide senior guidance as the TA is performed.

4.2.2. Characterize LENR as disruptive technology

The energy (and perhaps other) technologies that will emerge from LENR will be described in detail to enable assessment of their direct and indirect impacts. Although considerable information is available, reasonable projections of the types of devices, the rates of deployment, and success in energy market penetration will be made.

4.2.3. Refine methodology for impact assessment and mitigative measures development

TA has a well-developed basic process that can be applied to specific technologies and social contexts. This methodology will be refined for the LENR case based on the detailed characterization of the preceding step. It will include clear identification of the public and private entities that will be directly or indirectly impacted.

4.2.4. Delineate direct impacts on energy infrastructure

Impacts on the components of the full cycle of energy production, transportation, storage, and consumption will be identified. Because LENR is likely to be deployed as both a centralized and dispersed energy source, different components will be affected differently. The rate of deployment and market penetration in the energy sectors will be included in the assessment. As the type, degree, and rate of direct impacts are delineated, mitigation alternatives will be identified.

4.2.5. Assess indirect impact on social systems

A large portion of society is closely tied to the current energy infrastructure. The social elements that will be impacted can be determined from the components of the energy infrastructure identified above. Because social systems are likely to have limited ability to discern and deal with emerging disruptive impacts, they may be particularly vulnerable. Proactive planning is therefore particularly important to mitigate the social costs of LENR deployment. Mitigation strategies will be prepared for the various entities having similar types of indirect impacts, such as communities, non-energy businesses, workforces, governments, and financial institutions.

4.2.6. Prepare integrated mitigation plan

It is clear that the disruptive impacts of LENR on the energy infrastructure and social systems will be closely related. The mitigative measures developed for the direct and indirect impacts will be reviewed, and a coordinated plan will be prepared to take advantage of efficiencies and avoid measures having cross purposes. The agencies and other entities available to implement mitigative actions will be identified in the plan.

5. Corollary Policy Considerations

Several factors must be taken into account for LENR policymaking to be effective:

- Opportunities for agencies to accomplish their energy-related missions by incorporating LENR in their scope.
- Differences in the agencies involved in supporting research and dealing with adverse impacts.
- Development of mitigation strategies in coordination with research support and LENR realization.
- Integration of planning and implementation among agencies both nationally and worldwide.
- Coordination of policies between the public and private sectors.
- Overcoming inertia of LENR rejection and continuing pariah status.

These factors will be addressed by exploring the opportunities and responsibilities of government agencies and the private sector as well as coordination and integration of their policies.

5.1. Agency opportunities

Policymaking for LENR development and impact mitigation present opportunities for national and international agencies to realize their energy-related missions [44]. Given the importance of LENR realization and dealing with its anticipated impacts, it may reasonably be argued that agencies have strong obligations toward LENR.

The types of agencies and their energy-related missions are quite different for LENR support and for mitigation of adverse impacts. For example, in the U.S. the Departments of Energy and Defense are entities having energy development interests. Examples of government entities having mandates for market intervention for the public interest are the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Health and Human Services.

5.2. Role of the private sector

Whereas governments have the twin role of LENR support and impact mitigation, the focus of the private sector is mainly on development. Market force will be essential for realization of LENR benefits, but it may be argued that the market cannot yet be fully engaged. Because of its challenges in reproducibility and adequate explanation, LENR continues to be a high risk for private sector investment. This risk is a principal argument for public support of research in its current early development stage. If the early-stage research is publicly funded, the private sector may then step in for applications and product development. At that point the power of market forces can be engaged to fully realize LENR benefits.

At the same time, it is noted that research is being funded by “angel investors” – not requiring a near-term reasonable rate of return – and (as noted above) by large companies (especially energy consumers) having large resources and a major stake in the success of LENR. A number of startups and other small companies are also pursuing LENR, particularly through empirical efforts to develop useful devices (rather than fundamental research for basic understanding of the phenomenon). Efforts by the private sector to realize the benefits of LENR will be enhanced by updating the current negative stances for intellectual property protection (patents, trademarks) by government entities, particularly in the US patent and Trade office [45].

5.3. Policy integration

Policymaking for dealing with the adverse secondary impacts of LENR energy must be coordinated with policies for its research support and for realization [46]. Timing of mitigation planning should follow the rate of development and anticipated market penetration. Such policy coordination will enhance efficiency and avoid plans having cross purposes. Coordination is also essential among agencies having similar responsibilities – support or mitigation planning – to meet their respective responsibilities (e.g. DOE and DOD, EPA and HHS). Policy coordination is also important among agencies at the international and national level and between the public and private sectors.

5.4. Overcoming inertia of rejection

Policymaking for LENR is strongly affected by its status as a pariah science.

In a sociology of science context of rationality, it may be asserted that the level of evidence of LENR must determine future policies for LENR research and realization as outlined above. However, LENR has a large inertia of negative perception. The importance of overcoming its pariah status cannot be overestimated. It is recognized that despite the advantages of translating scientific evidence into levels of evidence (POE, CCE, BRD) described above, the EBP approach may be constrained by the inertia of LENR’s negative perception and continuing pariah status.

If ultimately LENR becomes understood as a new – or extended – branch of nuclear physics (as well as a source of energy), it will almost certainly be recognized as “revolutionary science”. Such revolutionary developments that expand the boundaries of scientific knowledge are often initially rejected by mainstream science [47,48].

One scientist, a Nobel Laureate, disagrees with the way in which LENR was not accepted and has referred to the continued rejection as “pathological disbelief” [49].

One possible way of lifting LENR out of rejection is to show that it is science rather than pseudoscience. This approach amounts to asserting that an error occurred in the boundary work of science in the LENR case. An analysis of criteria set forth by three prominent boundary workers (science skeptics) – Irving Langmuir [50], Carl Sagan [51], and Michael Shermer [52,53] – has been performed for LENR [54]. The 27 overlapping criteria of the three skeptics were phrased as questions, and each question was answered for LENR. It was concluded that the criteria were met and that LENR is science, not pseudoscience.

6. Summary

LENR has tremendous potential benefits as a new source of abundant, cheap, and clean energy. But as it becomes widely deployed, it will also have major direct impacts on the energy infrastructure and indirect effects on associated elements of society.

The field was rejected as legitimate science within a year or so after it was announced by Fleischmann and Pons in 1989. Negative public policies for research support soon followed. But the field did not die out after rejection. It has continued to be pursued by researchers at many locations worldwide. Although much progress has been made in the past 30 years, it still has issues of insufficient reproducibility and inadequate understanding.

The time has come to reconsider negative policies toward LENR. Evidence-based policymaking is a rational approach for making decisions for research support in the public interest. Decisions based on the level of evidence will enhance the prospect of realizing LENR benefits. Because it will be a disruptive new technology, public policies are also needed to mitigate LENR's direct and indirect impacts. Technology assessment is a good method for dealing with the secondary impacts of LENR.

Private-sector entities will help LENR benefits to be realized through the impetus of market forces. Government intervention in the free market for supporting new beneficial technologies and for mitigating their disruptive impacts is also essential for the public welfare. Many agencies have a mission to develop new sources of energy. Others have a mandate to protect the public from adverse secondary impacts. Both types of agencies have the opportunity to help accomplish their missions by including LENR.

Policies for impact mitigation must be coordinated with support policies for efficiency and to avoid cross purposes. Similarly, integration of policies among agencies – and between the public and private sector – is essential for the public interest. Regardless of whether policy is guided by the level of evidence, or the need for proactive planning for impact mitigation, LENR will continue to have challenges in emerging from its long-standing rejection and continuing pariah status.

References

- [1] D. Nagel, Potential advantages and impacts of LENR generators of thermal and electrical power and energy, *Infinite Energy* **103** (2012) 11–17.
- [2] T. Birkland, *An Introduction to the Policy Process – Theories, Concepts, and Models of Public Policy Making*, M.E. Sharpe, 2001.
- [3] J. Anderson, *Public Policymaking*, 6th edn., Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 2006.
- [4] C. Christensen, *The Innovator's Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, 1997.
- [5] C. Winston, *Government Failure Versus Market Failure*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington, DC, 2006.
- [6] E. Mallove, *Fire from Ice: Searching for the Truth Behind the Cold Fusion Furor*, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, 1991.
- [7] J. Huizenga, *Cold Fusion: the Scientific Fiasco of the Century*, University of Rochester Press, New Brunswick, NJ, 2002.
- [8] R. Merton, *The Sociology of Science – Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1968.
- [9] M. Fleischmann, 2000, Reflections on the sociology of science and social responsibility in science in relationship to cold fusion, *Accountability Res.* **8**(19) (2008) 19–54.
- [10] B. Simon, *Undead Science: Science Studies and the Afterlife of Cold Fusion*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, NJ, 2002.
- [11] Altman and J. Bland, Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence, *British Medical J.* **311** (1995) 485.
- [12] D. Goodstein, Whatever happened to cold fusion? *American Scholar* **63,64**(4) (1994) 527.
- [13] D. Goodstein, Whatever happened to cold fusion? *Accountability Res.* **8**(19) (2008) 59.

- [14] T. Grimshaw, Evidence-based public policy for support of cold fusion (LENR) development, *17th Int. Conf. on Cold Fusion (ICCF-17)*, Poster (2012).
- [15] A. Cochrane, *Effectiveness and Efficiency: Random Reflections on Health Sciences*, Nuffield Provincial Hospitals Trust, London, 1972.
- [16] [16] D. Sackett, W. Rosenberg, J. Gray, R. Haynes and W. Richardson, Evidence based medicine: what it is and what it isn't, *British Medical J. (BMJ)* **312**(7023) (1996) 71–72.
- [17] W. Cascio, Evidence-based management and the marketplace for ideas, *Academy Management J.* **50** (2007) 1009–1012.
- [18] H. Davies, S. Nutley and P. Smith, *What Works? Evidence-based Policy and Practice in Public Services*, Bristol University Press, Bristol, England, 2000.
- [19] I. Sanderson, Evaluation, policy learning and evidence-based policy making, *Public Administration* **89**(1) (2002) 1–22.
- [20] R. Pawson, *Evidence-based Policy – a Realist Perspective*, Sage, London, 2006.
- [21] G. Garner, *Black's Law Dictionary*, 8th edn., West Group, St Paul, MN, 2004.
- [22] L. Loevinger, Standards of proof in science and law, *Jurimetrics J. Law, Sci. Technol.* **32** (1992) 323–344.
- [23] M. Fleischmann and S. Pons, Electrochemically induced nuclear fusion of deuterium, *J. Electroanal. Chem.* **261,262** (1989) 301–308.
- [24] M. Fleischmann, S. Pons, M. Anderson, L. Li and M. Hawkins, Calorimetry of the palladium–deuterium–heavy water system, *J. Electroanal. Chem.* **287** (1990) 293–348.
- [25] C. Beaudette, *Excess Heat: Why Cold Fusion Prevailed*, 2nd Edn., Oak Grove Press, South Bristol, ME, 2002.
- [26] E. Storms, *Science of Low Energy Nuclear Reaction: A Comprehensive Compilation of Evidence and Explanations about Cold Fusion*, World Scientific, Singapore, 2007.
- [27] D. Cravens and D. Letts, The enabling criteria of electrochemical heat: beyond reasonable doubt, *14th Int. Conf. on Condensed Matter Nucl. Sci. (ICCF-14)*, Proceedings, 2008.
- [28] R. Johnson and M. Melich, *Weight of evidence for the Fleischmann–Pons effect*, *14th Int. Conf. on Condensed Matter Nucl. Sci. (ICCF-14)*, Proceedings, 2008.
- [29] T. Grimshaw, R. Johnson and D. Letts, *Level of evidence of cold fusion existence: bayesian network analysis of early verification attempts*, Unpublished Manuscript, 2008.
- [30] T. Grimshaw, Evidence-based public policy toward cold fusion: rational choices for a potential alternative energy source. Master of Public Affairs Professional, LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin, 2008.
- [31] T. Sandle, Essential science: Google is running LENR experiments, *Digital Sci.*, July 8, 2019. <http://www.digitaljournal.com/tech-and-science/science/essential-science-google-is-running-cold-fusion-experiments/article/553511>.
- [32] K. Shubber, *The Long-Shot Science That Attracted Brad Pitt and Neil Woodford: Promise of Abundant Nuclear Power Propelled 'LENR' Company to \$918m Valuation*, *Financial Times, Energy Sector*, June 13, 2019, <https://www.ft.com/content/024cfc4a-8df6-11e9-a1c1-51bf8f989972>.
- [33] D. O'Brien and D. Marchand, *The Politics of Technology Assessment – Institutions, Processes, and Policy Disputes*, Lexington Books, Lexington, MA, 1982.
- [34] R. Rich, Systems of analysis, technology assessment, and bureaucratic power, *American Behavioral Scientist* **22,23** (1979) 393–416.
- [35] A. Lee and P. Bereano, Developing technology assessment methodology: some insights and experiences, *Technol. Forecasting Social Change* **19** (1) (1981) 15–31.
- [36] Author Unknown, 1979, *Closing the Environmental Decade - Assessment of the Seventies*, CQ Researcher Archives, November, Available from <http://library.cqpress.com/cqresearcher/document.php?id=cqresrre1979111600>.
- [37] G. Black, *Technology Assessment – What Should it Be?* George Washington University, Washington, DC, 1971.
- [38] [38] A. Porter, F. Rossini, S. Carpenter, A. Roper, R. Larson and J. Tiller, *A Guidebook for Technology Assessment and Impact Analysis*, Vol. 4, Elsevier, New York, NY, 1980.
- [39] M. Devine and M. Ballard, *Energy from the West: a Technology Assessment of Western Energy Resource Development*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, OK, 1981.
- [40] L. Johns et al., *A Technology Assessment of Coal Slurry Pipelines*, Office of Technology Assessment, Washington, DC, 1978.
- [41] T. Grimshaw, Public policy planning for broad deployment of cold fusion (LENR) for energy production, 17th Int. Conf. on

- Cold Fusion (ICCF-17), Paper FrM1-1, 2012.
- [42] L. Hennen, Participatory technology assessment: a response to technical modernity? *Sci. Public Policy* **26**(5) (1999) 303–312.
- [43] J. Durant, 1999, Participatory technology assessment and the democratic model of the public understanding of science, *Sci. Public Policy*, **26**(5) (1999) 313–319.
- [44] T. Grimshaw and D. Nagel, 2016, Responsibilities of U.S. government agencies for support of low energy nuclear reactions, Presentation at the *20th Int. Conf. on LENR (ICCF-20)*.
- [45] T. Grimshaw and D. Nagel, 2016, Responsibilities of US government agencies for support of low energy nuclear reactions, *20th Int. Conf. on Cold Fusion (ICCF-20)*, Presentation and Paper, 2016.
- [46] T. Grimshaw, Integrated policymaking for realizing benefits and mitigating impacts of LENR, *19th Int. Conf. on Cold Fusion (ICCF-19)*, Presentation, 2015.
- [47] T. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd edn., Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1970.
- [48] W. Sharrock and R. Read, *Kuhn: Philosopher of Scientific Revolutions*, Blackwell, Cambridge, England, 2002.
- [49] B. Josephson, *Pathological Disbelief*, Lecture Given at the Nobel Laureates' Meeting, June 30, Available at: <https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/handle/1810/247336>.
- [50] I. Langmuir (ed.), *Pathological Science*, Colloquium at The Knolls Research Laboratory, Niskayuna, NY, 1953.
- [51] C. Sagan, *The Demon-Haunted World – Science as a Candle in the Dark*, Random House, New York, NY, 1995.
- [52] M. Shermer, *The Borderlands of Science – Where Sense Meets Nonsense*, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2001.
- [53] M. Shermer, Baloney Detection – How to Draw Boundaries between Science and Pseudoscience, Part I, *Scientific American* **285**(5) (2001).
- [54] E. Storms and T. Grimshaw, 2010, Judging the validity of the Fleischmann–Pons effect, *J. Condensed Matter Nucl. Sci.* **3**(9) (2010) 9–30.