

Research Article

How to Fix Global Warming With Cold Fusion

Jed Rothwell

LENR-CANR.org

Abstract

Cold fusion can eliminate the threat of global warming two ways:

1. Cold fusion does not produce carbon dioxide so if it replaces other sources of energy carbon emissions would stop.
2. Cold fusion can enhance the removal of carbon from the atmosphere by reforestation.

Large scale reforestation projects have been proposed to remove carbon from the atmosphere and sequester it in trees. Cold fusion technology would greatly enhance such projects, increasing the amount of carbon by a factor of ten and reducing the cost of the project by a large factor. Cold fusion can be used to stop the natural boom and bust cycle of forest carbon, by burying charcoal made from deadwood underground. In effect this would speed up the formation of coal by a factor of a million. Conventional energy sources cannot do this.

© 2023 ICCF. All rights reserved. ISSN 2227-3123

Keywords: Global warming, future, carbon sequestration, reforestation, economics

1. Introduction

Cold fusion is not a chemical reaction. It is not any form of combustion. Like nuclear fission or plasma fusion, it adds no carbon dioxide to the atmosphere. So, if all energy were produced with cold fusion, carbon dioxide would stop increasing. However, the carbon dioxide already in the atmosphere would remain, possibly for centuries, unless we take active steps to remove it.

Many biologists, forestry experts and climatologists have advocated sequestering carbon by growing more trees. That is, by reforesting parts of North America, Europe and China that have lost forest in the last 300 years. This would be a megaproject in which trillions of trees are planted, in millions of square kilometers. Cold fusion would enhance this project. It would make the project far cheaper and faster, and it would remove ~10 times more carbon per square kilometer than the projects that have been proposed.

2. Engineering Basis for These Claims

Cold fusion researchers may feel that the predictions in this paper have no engineering basis, and they are mere speculation. I believe data from the most successful experiments justify these predictions. To use cold fusion for nearly all applications you need six things:

© 2023 ICCF. All rights reserved. ISSN 2227-3123

Table 1. Cold fusion cathodes from the best experiments compared to fission reactor fuel pellets.

	Volume	Operating Temperature	Power Density by Volume	Power Density by Area
Cold fusion cathode	0.3 cm ³	100°C	300 W/cm ³	16 W/cm ²
Fission reactor fuel pellet	1.0 cm ³	300°C	180 W/cm ³	32 W/cm ²

1. Sufficiently high power density.
2. High Carnot efficiency.
3. High energy density.
4. Perfect safety with no tritium, or at least no tritium leaks.
5. Reasonably low cost materials and manufacturing.
6. Control over the reaction.

High power density and Carnot efficiency are needed to make reasonably compact devices. If power density is low, a cold fusion generator would be too large for direct use, like a solar panel array. An array can power an electric car, but it is far too large to fit on the roof of the car.

One of the most successful experiments on record was performed by Roulette, Roulette and Pons [1]. Their tests produced 17 to 100 W, for up to 70 days continuously, in boiling cells. Experiment 3 produced 294 MJ from 3.6 g of palladium. This is comparable to the power density of a nuclear fission core fuel pellet (Table 1). A fission reactor core by itself is compact. The reactor as a whole needs a great deal of shielding, so it is not compact. If the core were safe without shielding, it would be compact enough for nearly any application.

A fission reactor runs at 300°C, giving Carnot efficiency of around 30%. The experiment by Roulette *et al.* was in unpressurized cells so the temperature was 100°C. It could easily be pressurized to 300°C or more, so it could also achieve 30% efficiency with most types of heat engines.

Cold fusion devices do not produce dangerous radiation. A few have produced tritium. Perhaps this can be prevented. If not, tritium is safely contained in today's wristwatches and hallway exit signs. Since a cold fusion cell will be tightly sealed tritium can probably be contained in them.

High energy density is assured. With Pd-D cold fusion, the ratio of energy to helium is 24 MeV, the same as one path in plasma fusion.

Materials in most cells are abundant and manufacturing processes should not be particularly expensive.

Complete control over the reaction obviously has not been achieved. I believe that with enough research funding it will be. This is shown by the history of other inventions such as internal combustion engines, transistors, masers and lasers. The initial laboratory prototypes took years to produce, and they were unreliable. The first maser prototype took three years to make [2]. Today we manufacture millions of these devices, and they are so reliable you can bet your life on them. As you do whenever you fly on an airplane.

3. How to Remove Carbon Dioxide With Cold Fusion

With cold fusion we would stop adding carbon dioxide to the atmosphere. We can also remove the carbon we have already added. We put it back underground where it came from. We do this by growing billions of trees. When they are old, we cut them down and bury them underground in abandoned coal mines.

Growing trees to sequester carbon is not a new idea. Biologists, forestry experts and climatologists have recommended this in many project proposals (Table 2). In this paper, I describe how to enhance these projects with cold fusion. Cold fusion would make carbon removal far cheaper, faster, and 10 times more effective per square kilometer.

Table 2. Recent examples of proposals to sequester carbon with reforestation.

Reforest Action, Contribute to the Global Carbon Neutrality . . . by Funding the creation and preservation of Forests, https://www.reforestaction.com/en/contribution-climate , 19 million trees planted
University of Auckland, Can reforestation help reverse the extinction crisis? https://www.thebigq.org/2019/06/12/can-reforestation-help-reverse-the-extinction-crisis
Congressional Research Service, U.S. Tree Planting for Carbon Sequestration, https://sgp.fas.org/crs/misc/R40562.pdf
Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Planting trees to mitigate climate change: Policy incentives could lead to increased carbon sequestration, https://www.fs.usda.gov/treearch/pubs/61873
YOUNG TREES ARE BETTER! World Resources Institute, Young Forests Capture Carbon Quicker than Previously Thought, https://www.wri.org/insights/young-forests-capture-carbon-quicker-previously-thought
NO! OLD TREES ARE BETTER! Pacific Forest Trust, E&E: Old trees store more carbon, more quickly, than younger trees, https://www.pacificforest.org/ee-old-trees-store-more-carbon-more-quickly-than-younger-trees/ Most other sources say that younger trees store more carbon per year. See also Figure 1 caption.
100 YEARS TO STORE 10 YEARS OF EMISSIONS (I say 100 years to sequester all anthropogenic emissions) Frontiers in Forest and Global Change, Forests and Decarbonization – Roles of Natural and Planted Forests, https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/ffgc.2020.00058/ The authors do not consider growing field crop indoors; irrigating deserts; or burying deadwood anaerobically in abandoned coal mines, OR cold fusion.

4. Carbon Sequestration Project Outline

The project would begin by expanding forests with two technologies that are not related to cold fusion: indoor farms, and “cultured meat” grown from animal cells. These two greatly reduce the amount of land devoted to agriculture.

Indoor farms are already common in many parts of the world. They take up much less space than outdoor farms, and they use less water, no pesticides, and in some climates, less energy. The Netherlands is a small country, yet it is now the second largest agricultural exporter by value, after the United States, because they grow huge quantities of food indoors. One-third of the fresh tomatoes sold in the U.S. are grown indoors [3], [4]. Cold fusion would enhance indoor farms (Ref. [5], p. 130).

Cultured meat is still under development. This is not plant-based imitation meat such as the Impossible Burger. It is actual meat, grown *in vitro* from animal cells. If this pans out, it will reduce the land devoted to agriculture, because 80% of land is used for livestock production [6].

The land no longer used for agriculture can be used for living space, but much of it should be returned to nature. It should be reforested, partially restoring the North American ecosystem to the way it was before European colonization. Forests should also be expanded in Europe, especially in places such as Scotland, where hills are now barren that were forested in the 18th century [7].

Cold fusion can help do this in a cost effective manner. It can do much more. Over the last 3,000 years, people expanded the Sahara and Gobi deserts by over-farming. This can be reversed with cold fusion powered desalination plants, and tap-root irrigation, which uses less water than conventional techniques. We could build roughly as many desalination plants as there are automobile assembly plants now. In fifty years, we could convert 3.5 million square kilometers of desert into verdant land, the way it was before human civilization. This is about a third of the Sahara and Gobi. It is also about a third of the land area of the United States. We would plant trees on the new land. After about fifty years the desalination plants would wear out, but we would not need to build many new ones because once the forests are established, natural rainfall increases. Reforestation of desert areas with minimal irrigation has been done successfully in Israel. Over the last 60 years, Israel has greatly increased forested land in arid and desert areas. The 3,000 hectare Yatir Forest in the Negev Desert is a good example.




Figure 1. Tree growth patterns. Culmination in mean annual growth occurs after 40 to 50 years. Some experts think old growth forests continue to sequester carbon. “[W]hether carbon accumulation continues or peaks when net additional wood growth is minimal (in “old-growth” forests) is disputed.” Ref. [8].

The desert areas would become more livable for humans and other species. The population would increase. Towns and cities would be built, increasing land values. I do not think the land will be needed for agriculture because I assume indoor farming will be superior. But if outdoor farming continues, the new verdant land will greatly increase worldwide production of food.

This is a grand reforestation megaproject to reduce carbon in the atmosphere. With cold fusion, it is larger and more ambitious than anything proposed by the experts. The tree planting and forestry management part of the project is also hundreds of times cheaper. Bringing the deserts back to life would be expensive, but it would produce ancillary benefits worth trillions of dollars.

Cold fusion would enhance this megaproject in ways that would remove at least 10 times more carbon per square kilometer than the experts think is possible. Here is why. The new trees in North America, the Sahara and the Gobi deserts would capture vast amounts of carbon dioxide as they grow. But experts point to two problems. First, when the trees mature into a climax forest, they largely stop capturing carbon dioxide, according to most experts. (Some dispute this, as noted in Table 2 and the caption for Figure 1.) Second, when there is a forest fire, or when the trees die and decompose, much of the carbon dioxide returns to the atmosphere. This is called the natural boom & bust cycle of forest carbon (Figure 2).

We need to stop this cycle before the carbon release phase (Figure 3).

To interrupt the cycle, we harvest the deadwood (fallen trees and branches). The deadwood should be cut into chips, which are then baked into charcoal with cold fusion. The charcoal is taken to abandoned open-pit coal mines and buried underground, in anaerobic conditions. In other words, these pits would become reverse coal mines. We now dig up coal from a few mines, and send it to 230 power plants scattered around the country. With this project, we would collect solid carbon from many locations around the country, ship it to the mines, and put it back underground. In effect, this is speeding up the natural formation of underground coal by a factor of a million.

The wood is cut into chips to make it easier to transport. It is made into charcoal because charcoal has less mass to transport and bury, and it is less likely to rot.

If this project were done with fossil fuel, the baking and transport of the chips would add far more carbon dioxide to the atmosphere than the project removes. This is easily estimated from the caloric content of wood, 20 MJ/kg (about as much as 435 g of gasoline). Chipping 1 kg of wood, baking it into charcoal, transporting it to North Dakota, and burying it would take far more than 20 MJ. If this project were done with wind, solar and other renewable energy, it would cost vast amounts of money. It is only technically feasible and economically possible with cold fusion.




Figure 2. The natural boom & bust cycle of forest carbon. U.S. Forestry Service.

After about a century of burying carbon underground, we would sequester roughly as much carbon as we have added to the atmosphere since the beginning of the industrial revolution (Figure 4). The cumulative total is 1,710 billion tons. Suppose we put carbon back underground at the rate we emitted it in 1966, 15 billion tons. In 114 years, we would bury the excess carbon.

Charcoal is 60% to 80% carbon, so we need to bury about 21 billion tons of charcoal per year to sequester 15 billion tons of carbon. Worldwide coal extraction was 7.9 billion tons in 2019 [9]. So, we put the carbon back at about 2.6 times the rate we now mine coal.

Wood is approximately 50% carbon, so we need to chip 30 billion tons of deadwood a year. This goal cannot be met without new forests in irrigated deserts. If the deserts are not irrigated, the project will take about 200 years.

Worldwide production of lumber is approximately 1.3 billion tons per year (2.2 billion m³). So, we increase forestry by a factor of 23.

Removing excessive deadwood improves the health of the forest overall, and reduces severe forest fires. Not all deadwood should be removed. Rotting wood is essential to the ecology, but there is too much in many forests today. Removing deadwood need not be done often. This would disrupt fauna and bother people living nearby. Deadwood could be removed every 10 years or so, in a cleanup that lasts a few days to a week.

To make 30 billion tons of wood chips, I think it would be best to use small, flying, cold fusion powered robots, the size of woodpeckers. Woodpeckers and insects demolish millions of fallen trees without much disruption.

A flying robot the size of a woodpecker may seem implausible, or risible. It may seem that such a small machine would take far too long to demolish an entire tree. However, large numbers of these machines working in coordinated groups could do this in a reasonable amount of time. Figure 5 shows a pileated woodpecker making a hole. Holes are




Figure 3. Interrupting the natural boom & bust cycle of forest carbon before the carbon release phase.

rectangular. The larger ones are 10 cm × 14 cm, perhaps 4 cm deep: around ~500 ml. The birds can make 2 or 3 holes a day, roughly ~1 L. The birds weigh 300 g, and their metabolism is ~1.4 W (28.31 kcal/24 hour) [10]. Larger 1 kg flying robots, with 140 W of thermoelectric power, and cutting blades that make 53 L of wood chips per day should be possible. They would be a combination of a flying drone, a cell phone, and a Dremel cutting tool. A tree service company would use about 20 of them to demolish a 15 m pine tree in one day. You would need a fleet of 3.1 billion of them to remove 30 billion tons of wood per year. 3.1 billion may seem like a large number, but it is not. If the robots last 10 years, we need to manufacture 310 million per year. Compare this to the number of cell phones we make, 1.3 billion per year.

The robots can be made quieter than today's drones and cutting tools by using electroactive polymers (EAP). They would also be longer lasting, requiring less maintenance and replacement parts. An EAP resembles an artificial muscle. It contracts when electricity is passed through it. An EAP-powered flying drone would have flapping wings, rather than the propellers used in today's drones. Small, flapping wing drones are more complicated than propeller aircraft, but the engineering problems are being solved and such machines will be perfected soon. Wings are much quieter than propellers because they move slower, pushing a larger volume of air with each stroke. This is why a hawk can fly low and silently across a field to snatch a squirrel off the ground. I have seen hawks do this. One flew just over my head and landed on a fence a meter away from me before I noticed it.

An EAP cutting blade might pinch, like an insect taking a bite out of wood. This should be quieter than a rapidly spinning circular blade.

Why use miniature flying robots? Why not make human sized chainsaws and woodchippers like the ones we have now, only powered by cold fusion? There are several good reasons to make them smaller: They can fly up into the




Figure 4. Graph of carbon dioxide emissions since 1750.

tree, rather than climbing. If they fall out of the tree, they cause no damage. They would be quieter than chainsaws. They would not need logging roads. They could fly into wilderness areas in California to remove deadwood without roads and without disturbing the environment. This would reduce wildfires. They do not need human operators, so they would be much cheaper and safer. Climbing trees and cutting with chainsaws is dangerous work.

If these are such good reasons, why don't we make small gasoline or battery-powered robots now? Because they would not be practical. You would have to refuel or recharge them a dozen times a day. They could not fly into the California wilderness; they would run out of fuel. Cold fusion machines run for years on a drop of fuel, so they do not need fuel tanks, and they can be any size. You pick the best size for the application, rather than being hemmed in by the limitations of the technology.

When you think about future cold fusion technology, you should rethink the size of machines. Think small. Cold fusion robotic machines do not have to be made on a human scale, the way chainsaws are. Rethink everything. The scale, the methods, the economics should all be considered anew.

This global warming reversal project would be a continental-scale megaproject. But so is the flow of coal from under the ground to coal-fired generators today. We hardly notice that. This project is no more complicated than today's forestry and coal mining. The project as a whole, including bringing the deserts back to life, would be the most profitable enterprise in history. For a trivial cost we would create trillions of dollars in wealth.

I estimate the reforestation in North America and Europe would cost roughly 100 times less than the experts do, because the work will be done by cold fusion robots. I also estimate it can remove all of the carbon in 100 years, whereas most experts say it can only remove 10 years' worth of emissions (Table 2). They are pessimistic mainly



Figure 5. Pileated woodpecker making a feeding hole. <https://ebird.org/species/pilwoo>

because of the boom and bust cycle. A climate researcher wrote an op-ed in the New York Times on June 4, 2022 titled, “Let’s Not Pretend Planting Trees Is a Permanent Climate Solution” [11]. The gist of it was that because of the boom and bust cycle, carbon in trees eventually returns to the atmosphere:

Trees can quickly and cost-effectively remove carbon from the atmosphere today. But when companies rely on them to offset their emissions, they risk merely hitting the climate “snooze” button, kicking the can to future generations who will have to deal with those emissions. . . .

That is true. But with cold fusion we would stop the cycle. This author did not consider the possibility of burying the carbon in abandoned coal mines. He never thought of irrigating deserts to produce 5 million square kilometers of new forest. Or having miniature robots do the work. He did not think of these things because he has never heard of cold fusion. He did not imagine these things because without cold fusion *they are unimaginable*.

When modern electric lights began replacing inefficient incandescent lights in the late 20th century, they reduced both energy costs and equipment costs, because they last much longer. One expert said: “this is not a free lunch; it is a lunch you are paid to eat” [12]. That should be the motto of cold fusion.

References

- [1] Roulette, T., J. Roulette, and S. Pons. *Results of ICARUS 9 Experiments Run at IMRA Europe*. in *Sixth International Conference on Cold Fusion, Progress in New Hydrogen Energy*. 1996. Lake Toya, Hokkaido, Japan: New Energy and Industrial Technology Development Organization, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo, Japan.

- [2] Townes, C.H., *How the Laser Happened - Adventures of a scientist*. 1999: Oxford University Press.
- [3] *The Netherlands is the second-largest agricultural exporter after US*, in *DutchNews.nl*. 2018. <https://www.dutchnews.nl/news/2018/01/the-netherlands-is-the-second-largest-agricultural-exporter-after-us/>.
- [4] Alexander, W., *Indoor Farming Is a 'No-Brainer.' Except for the Carbon Footprint*, in *New York Times*. 2022.
- [5] Rothwell, J., *Cold Fusion And The Future*. 2004: LENR-CANR.org.
- [6] <https://ourworldindata.org/agricultural-land-by-global-diets>
- [7] Trees for Life, Deforestation <https://treesforlife.org.uk/into-the-forest/habitats-and-ecology/human-impacts/deforestation/>
- [8] Gorte, R.W., *U.S. Tree Planting for Carbon Sequestration*. 2009, U.S. Congress: Congressional Research Service.
- [9] *Statistics report, Coal Information, Overview*. 2020, International Energy Agency (IEA). https://iea.blob.core.windows.net/assets/a5f208e9-f66b-4d31-b5af-87d581b70c18/Coal_Information_Overview_2020_edition.pdf.
- [10] Long, C.A., *Exponential Relations of Standard Metabolic Rates of Birds and Weights of Eggs*. The Wilson Bulletin, 1973. **84**(3).
- [11] Housfather, Z., *Let's Not Pretend Planting Trees Is a Permanent Climate Solution*, in *New York Times*. 2022.
- [12] Fickett, A.P., C.W. Gellings, and A.B. Lovins, *Efficient Use of Electricity*. Scientific American, 1990. **263**(3): p. 64-75 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24996931>.