

**From:** Martin Claussen <[martin.claussen@zmaw.de](mailto:martin.claussen@zmaw.de)>  
**Date:** September 24, 2010 2:17:48 AM PDT  
**To:** Claudia Kubatzki <[kubatzki@o2online.de](mailto:kubatzki@o2online.de)>  
**Subject:** mediation  
**Reply-To:** Martin Claussen <[martin.claussen@gmx.net](mailto:martin.claussen@gmx.net)>

[Originally in German]

Dear Claudia,

Yesterday, Ulrike Herzs Schuh called me and asked for advice and mediation. It concerns her/your publication in GEBL. Apparently, Ulrike hadn't informed you about the resubmission of your article, that already had been submitted to other journals but had been rejected. She has listed you as co-author without your approval. In principle, that is not OK and you can rightly protest.

But - I ask you to reconsider a few points that cast a milder light on Ulrike's course of action. Ulrike hasn't acted maliciously but in good faith. I know of at least one case where, after the departure of a colleague, this colleague has been deleted from the list of authors. That is mistreating a colleague and is very clearly to be classified as scientific misconduct. Ulrike didn't want to mistreat a colleague but adequately acknowledge your scientific work and your contribution to the article. She had not been able to reach you by email or phone and had been - naively, but in good faith - assuming that you would agree to a resubmission, just as you had agreed to the resubmission of the article to other journals before. The content of the article hasn't fundamentally changed anyway. Overall, I think this is not gross scientific misconduct but a "lesser sin".

No damage of your scientific reputation resulted for you from the publication of your article in GEBL. The scientific content of the article is in no way disreputable, the authors involved have a good scientific reputation. If you want to continue to stay in science, an additional publication is even useful. If you insist on your protest, a stale aftertaste will remain that also sticks to you. Ulrike will be well able to prove her good faith. Why - one will wonder - have you actually filed a protest?

After considering all things, I sincerely ask you to seriously think about withdrawing your protest at GEBL, or to just put your protest on record without pushing for consequences.

Warm greetings

Martin

**From:** Claudia Kubatzki <[kubatzki@o2online.de](mailto:kubatzki@o2online.de)>  
**Date:** September 26, 2010 6:02:06 PM PDT  
**To:** Martin Claussen <[martin.claussen@zmaw.de](mailto:martin.claussen@zmaw.de)>  
**Cc:** Martin Claussen <[martin.claussen@gmx.net](mailto:martin.claussen@gmx.net)>  
**Subject:** Interference

[Originally in German]

Martin,

Your email deeply saddened me. A man I once greatly respected and admired seems lost to me and in danger of losing that respect and admiration more widely as well.

You did not even ask my side of the story, just condemned me after believing Ulrike's desperate story at face value. That is very demeaning to me, who was devoted to you for so many years, and it is bad science to boot. I'll tell you briefly my side of the story below, to give you a chance to reconsider. First though, since it is exactly analogous: should I contact Ulrike's former advisor and ask that he talk to Ulrike and get her to admit her intentional misconduct and accept the consequences like a responsible adult? Would you consider that acceptable? The fact that she contacted you has made me even more determined to seek real consequences for her unethical behavior.

Before telling you my side of the story, I would like to ask you something else: how many more times will you cover up Ulrike's and Gerrit's unethical behavior? At some point - and I do not look forward to this - all this has to come back and then make you look as unethical as them; and to more people than just those involved now. And this case already now extends well beyond just a small part of the German science system. I am a US Permanent Resident and at a US university, the GEB chief editor is Canadian, the GEB editor who took the illegal submission is Swedish, the GEB publishing agent involved is British and the publisher is US. And we are talking here about violations of copyright, which is a serious legal matter. Are you not familiar with "Climategate" and the new environment that the affair has caused in journal publishing? Faking a person's agreement to a publication is a lie in which you can get caught very easily. Didn't you ever wonder if people who do things like that might also lie in areas in which they can't get caught that easily, such as faking their own data?

My side of the story:

Regarding Ulrike's lie that she thought I wouldn't mind: I am more than a little hurt that you don't remember the incident where - out of work - I tried to get a position I really wanted with Ulrike but Gerrit threatened to sabotage her evaluation and Ulrike didn't fight for me but just caved in. Apparently my suffering didn't mean much to you. In any case, I was furious with Ulrike; she knew that and you did too at one time. That was the last time I ever spoke with her. She absolutely, without doubt, knew I would never agree to be an author with her on a paper (and I can prove that). That was the reason why she did not contact me.

Ulrike says she tried to contact me before publishing without my knowledge but could not reach me. Her two successful emails to me, at two different addresses, within hours of being contacted by the GEB chief editor show that to be completely ridiculous. Further, if she could not contact me, the default should have been not to publish. She could also have removed my part of the work and published without that part. But she well knew that she needed my part of the work and my reputation to get the article published.

Regarding the paper being not fundamentally different from previous submissions I did agree to. Yes, but after three rejections that I knew of, it was clear to me that the paper was not worthy of publication. It had always been a very weak paper, as attested to by the rejections and reviews. And judging from the reviews from the illegal submission I just got the paper was again judged extremely weak and would have probably been rejected if not for the intervention of the editor who had accepted the submission and had apparently been working with Ulrike.

In the response to the reviewers of the illegal submission someone also posed as me. That is even more severe misconduct than publishing without my agreement and I will pursue this issue vigorously.

Regarding there being no damage to my reputation: the paper was published with my name with an AWI affiliation. When it was published I had already been at the University of Alaska Fairbanks for about 9 months. And the article was in a journal that is relevant also to the field I work in now. What do you think my advisor and my department think to see my name on a peer-reviewed journal article with a non-UAF affiliation from years ago, especially at a time when funding is tight and more publications mean more money? Plus, unlike you, many people remember I was furious with Gerrit and Ulrike and that I wanted to have nothing more to do with them. What do you think these people think of me seeing me all of a sudden published with them? I will inform these people though, one way or another.

In reconsidering with the above, I urge you to counsel Ulrike to truly admit her intentional misconduct and accept the consequences. People will be more sympathetic to her if she truly admits her crime and asks to be forgiven, rather than making up excuses that can easily be disproved. Additionally, she should make sure Gerrit is brought to justice as well, as his unethical behavior is the root cause of all of this. She can start by telling the GEB chief editor that Gerrit was the one that pretended to be me in the response to reviewers, if that is the case.

Claudia

**From:** Martin Claussen <[martin.claussen@zmaw.de](mailto:martin.claussen@zmaw.de)>

**Date:** September 29, 2010 12:58:15 PM PDT  
**To:** Claudia Kubatzki <[kubatzki@o2online.de](mailto:kubatzki@o2online.de)>  
**Subject: Re: Interference**

[Originally in German]

Dear Claudia,

I was so amazed by your letter that I read the old email correspondence between Ulrike, you, and me. At the time, there were many attempts to talk to you. I have to say that I cannot understand your hatred towards Ulrike. And when I read how I have tried to help you during the conflict with Gerrit, I am surprised how much you choose the wrong tone of voice towards me now. I indeed just want to mediate, but if now you only think in categories such as truth, lie, and crime, we don't need to talk anymore.

Many greetings

Martin

**From:** Claudia Kubatzki <[kubatzki@o2online.de](mailto:kubatzki@o2online.de)>  
**Date:** October 1, 2010 1:02:58 PM PDT  
**To:** Martin Claussen <[martin.claussen@zmaw.de](mailto:martin.claussen@zmaw.de)>  
**Cc:** Martin Claussen <[martin.claussen@gmx.net](mailto:martin.claussen@gmx.net)>  
**Subject: Re: Interference**

[Originally in German]

... exactly right, Martin, we don't need to talk anymore: as I already indicated, you do not know enough about the whole situation to be drawn into it. And your emails from the first incident with Gerrit and Ulrike are only a small part of what happened; there were some other things going on then that you still do not know now. At the time I was amazed and appalled at how Gerrit was using you and now Ulrike is doing the same. And it still hurts me to see you used by disreputable people such as Gerrit. It makes you look foolish and not the man I once respected and admired. I do know, just like Ulrike does, all that went on and my choice of "tone" is appropriate. I had hoped you had enough confidence in me after all our years working together to have assumed this. In any case, please try to stay out of this matter.

Claudia