

Date: Mon, 03 Jul 2006 13:34:30 -0400
From: Rusi Taleyarkhan <rusi@ecn.purdue.edu>
To: "Coblentz, William" <William.Coblentz@darpa.mil>
CC: rusi@purdue.edu
Subject: Re: Feedback on Sonofusion review (rpt->coblentz;7/3/06)

Bill:

A quick followup to our discussion today. I made this call to explain my position for not having DARPA acknowledged in my recent 1/06 DARPA paper on self-nucleated sonofusion expts. The self-nucleation work was one of the focus areas of my efforts since coming to Purdue about 3y ago; the DARPA/UCLA funding had not been put up on the books by the time we had our kickoff meeting on May 23,2005. Therefore, the actual work started in June, 2005 although I had spent quite a bit of time before that talking with you all and preparing for the kickoff.

By early June a draft of the 1/06 paper was already being prepared for journal submission. As you know it takes half a year or some times more than a year from that point on to get a paper published. Reveiws, etc. took several months and the paper was accepted after which there was a gap before it could be queued for publication during 1/06. Several co-authors and I all contributed our time for this work in addition to use of internal funds for post-doc support where we have latitude. This is why DARPA was not acknowledged and I offered this explanation with your acknowledgment /understanding out of respect for your past support. Thx. As you well-know, my earlier works in Science(2002) and Phys.Rev.E (2004) both gratefully acknowledged DARPA's support.

As you correctly pointed out in your 3/6/06 email to us all, the DARPA go-no go milestone was meant to be the replication of external (not self) nucleated sonofusion experimentation - that was the focus of my activities with your project funds and we were making progress until the project terminated at the end of 3/06. This was not met and I understand your conclusion for the absence of Phase II funding.

On 3/1/06 out of good faith and for going beyond the call (which I did not have to do), I had two not one experiments set up for your review visit: (1) external neutron induced sonofusion per my agreement with DARPA/UCLA which we had not come back to speed on as your email below attests; and, (2) self-nucleated expt. with deuterated benzene where we fortunately demonstrated to the entire group of visitors of statistically significant positive/successful results which several people in the audience confirmed by reading the neutron tracks themselves - these data were taken with a passive neutron detector as reported in my PRL paper.

In any case, thanks for your support. Have a good 4th holiday tomorrow.

Rusi

(PS: I also voiced my concern at the citation of DARPA's support for the modeling/simulation of my 1/06 PRL experiments in Naranjo's work which you mentioned that you have not specifically asked them to do. While I appreciate your view that it was a grant not a contract to UCLA, the non-peer reviewed reports in 3/8/06 Nature and on the web by Naranjo (from Putterman's group) are seen worldwide as allegations of wrong-doing rather than efforts at enabling sonofusion - distressing and damaging despite being unfounded as I've explained to you. Rebutting only straightens the situation in the technical archives, not in the public opinion world which latches on to any negative sensationalized story.)