

**Miller, Joan**

---

**From:** Coblenz, William [William.Coblenz@darpa.mil]  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 08, 2006 11:32 PM  
**To:** Wax, Steven  
**Cc:** Walker, Jan; Browning, Valerie  
**Subject:** Fw: heads up re Nature and Rusi etc.

For your information.

Rusi has told me the work on the alpha particle nucleation in acetone and blends with benzene were done using his start up funds at Purdue.

William S. Coblenz, PhD  
DARPA, Defense Sciences Office  
Phone: (571) 218-4647  
E-Mail: william.coblenz@darpa.mil

Sent from my BlackBerry Handheld.

----- Original Message -----

From: Seth Putterman <puherman@ritva.physics.ucla.edu>  
To: Coblenz, William; 'Parbury Schmidt' <psschmidt@verizon.net>  
Sent: Sat Jul 08 19:00:50 2006  
Subject: heads up re Nature and Rusi etc.

Friends!

-- Nature is zeroing in on a short story re whether or not RT was fed funded. Will appear next week. Gist is that Nature in the course of writing story in march noticed that fed funding was not acknowledged. So Nature called Putterman to ask about how the money was spent at Purdue and so on. Nature has written to RT to ask if the lack of acknowledgment was a simple oversight and RT won't answer and Purdue says that RT has given them assurances that the project published in Jan 06 PRL was not fed funded. So why much ado about such a technicality? Here's where the story might become dicey. Are fed standards for scientific misconduct investigations more strenuous? Does RT have a motive for this action? Does Purdue have a motive for backing RT in this matter? Nature told me that there was a very nasty case in New Hampshire where fed funding was intentionally not acknowledged, this was a key issue and the prof went to jail. This might be mentioned in the upcoming story. That's all I know.

The facts are that RT was paid at 100% from grant for at least 2 months before paper submitted. In my strong opinion Rusi was funded with taxpayer money.

I asked Rusi to send in a simple erratum pointing out this oversight. That would be the end of it. That would kill the Nature story and leave Purdue free to do its inquiry in peace. But he won't do it. Bizarre!

1496

--More Important: We are in the home stretch with the neg results for D-Acetone. It is brutal writing a neg results paper. Here's why. If you make a discovery the paper can be sloppy as long as it includes the necessary info for replication. But if you claim that a discovery doesn't exist, your paper has to be perfect.

We are suffering but we are almost there.

Best from

Seth