

-----  
Date: 23-OCT-1989 10:45:26.37  
From: "SCHIFFER@ANLPHY (312)972-4066 FAX:972-3903" <SCHIFFER@ANLPHY>  
To: rlg2@yktvmv.BITNET  
Subject:  
X-ANJE-To: GARWIN,SCHIFFER

I left a message for Woodard and spoke to Huizenga (who wanted to call you).

Even if you do not find time to suggest specific wording would appreciate your opinion on what we should or should not say in our section on the issues I mentioned last night. My inclination is to mention the Russian and BNL work as tentatively as possible and state that it has nothing to do with cold fusion -- all in one sentence.

John H. also asked for suggested wording for the summary -- here I think the issue is how much we should hedge things (e.g. for Jones's result where Norman Ramsey tends to be more charitable than most of the rest of us).

Will look for possible messages tonight.

New Energy Times

-----  
Date: 23-OCT-1989 07:14:15.52  
From: "SCHIFFER@ANLPHY (312)972-4066 FAX:972-3903" <SCHIFFER@ANLPHY>  
To: RLG2@YKTVMV.BITNET  
Subject: RE: Woodard demands.  
X-ANJE-To: GATEWAY: "RLG2@YKTVMV",SCHIFFER

I will talk to Woodard about a day's delay.

On the NSF workshop, I do not take any of the data seriously -- at this point it is more a matter of public relations. My inclination is to ignore it and proceed as we had planned.

I tend to be skeptical about the Russian fracto fusion results. The Letter in Nature gives no information on how reproducible the effect is -- whether they tried it once or many times. They only say that

- a) the background was 0.05 counts/sec;
- b) that the effect observed was 0.31 +/- 0.13 counts/sec;
- c) that the greatest effect was 0.41 +/- 0.14 counts/sec when the drum was cooled to liquid nitrogen after the vibration stopped;
- d) that smaller effects of 0.14 +/- 0.02 counts were found with LiD;
- e) that after 3-4 cycles of 3-min vibration the neutron rate fell to background level.
- f) that control experiments gave null results;
- g) the detector efficiency was measured but is not quoted.

The statistics imply 10 - 20 counts, the figure shows about 30 -- does not say that it is from one run. Again, my inclination is to leave this out -- but it is more a public relations issue than a scientific one. We can be criticized for 'ignoring important positive results'. Somewhat the same goes for the BNL heavy water droplets -- I tend to be doubtful and it is not relevant to cold fusion -- but we may be criticized for omitting it.

Am inclined to leave it at that and respond to criticism if necessary,