
Date: 22-OCT-1989 10:54:55.54
From: "SCHIFFER@ANLPHY (312)972-4066 FAX:972-3903" <SCHIFFER@ANLPHY>
To: rlg2@yktvmv.BITNET
Subject:
X-ANJE-To: GARWIN,SCHIFFER

Dear Dick,

I hesitate to badger you, but Woodard wants a disk sent tomorrow, Monday with the latest version. If I do not hear from you will send what I have, and then incorporate changes after that. If you do happen to have some changes ready -- please let me have them before then.

More or less substantive issues I see for the neutron section, on which I would appreciate an opinion (if not text) are:

- a) What more to say about Menlove
- b) Should we include reference to the Russian work? Note that they have published another positive result in the last Nature 341 p 492, where they claim to see neutrons from Ti chips in a 'vibromill' with D2O and deuterated polypropylene.
- c) Should we include reference to the BNL water droplet acceleration?

A more general issue will be how to react, if at all, to the NSF workshop and the publicity they raised. I am told that they are planning to have a report for release about the same time as ours -- the tone is apparent from the NYT article last week.

I spoke to Gai. He feels that he is obligated to try and come up with a result jointly with Jones. Jones took the data tapes and wants to analyze them independently for two months -- Gai feels obligated to let him do this, so he does not plan to have any new data for us that he could let us include.

John

in - both.

New Energy Times

*300 keV
200 pW → 400
70 eV / mm = 280 x 10¹⁵
2 x 10⁵ → 10⁷ cal/yr.*

OPTIONS: ACK LOG LONG NOTEBOOK *
Local options: Search RealNode

Date: 22 October 1989, 23:15:08 EDT
From: (R.L.Garwin (914) 945-2555) RLG2 at YKTVMV
IBM Fellow and Science Advisor to the Director of Research
P.O. Box 218
Yorktown Hts, NY 10598
To: SCHIFFER at ANLPHYS
Subject: Woodard demands.
Reply-To: RLG2 at YKTVMV
Reply-Bit: RLG2 at WATSON
Reply-Xin: rlg2@ibm.com

- 1) They can't process all disks simultaneously. We should do our work right and submit the disk 10/25/89.
- 2) Menlove left Friday for China. I almost reached him in his last hour, but missed. I'll try to talk with Miller on Monday. I have nothing in writing from Menlove on H2-only or on simultaneous detection in separated detectors; unless we have that, I persist in my critical assessment.
- 3) I have Nature 341, but the issue before that containing p. 492. I think we can include the CLAIM, but it has more to do with fracto-fusion than with cold fusion.
- 4) As for NSF-EPRI, that seems to me to be a counter-offensive, come-up- with anything activity. Nate Lewis was there, and I have heard fourth-hand from him. It is ridiculous to imagine doubling the 25% Pd-106 level. And I would rather believe isotope enrichment reducing Li-6 in the first micron than nuclear reactions. Mostly, I don't believe either. Remember, BARC used NaOD, not LiOD. The Bard FAX is waiting for me at the lab. I'll see it at 0630 Monday; thus far I have seen only the Dave Goodwin FAX from the NSF-EPRI meeting.
- 5) Let's get a more realistic schedule from Bill Woodard.

Dick Garwin