

Dear Dr. Taleyarkhan,

We've spoken a couple of times in the past regarding Purdue's investigation of bubble fusion. I thought I would see if you have a few minutes to talk again either today or tomorrow. I am writing now, because as you likely know, Congressman Brad Miller's investigation's subcommittee of the House Science and Technology Committee is set to release tomorrow their views on Purdue's recent inquiries. As part of those views, they mention that Purdue has begun another inquiry, this time concerning the research underlying your group's scientific claims.

We are planning to write a news story about the subcommittee's report and the new Purdue inquiry. If you would be willing to share your thoughts on them, I would greatly appreciate it, and I believe it would lend our news coverage the balance we strive to offer.

I am happy to call you at a time and number you suggest. Alternatively, please feel free to contact me.

Thanks for your help.

Best Regards,

Bob

Robert Service  
Staff Writer  
Science Magazine

\*\*\*\*\*

Date: Thu, 10 May 2007 21:24:24 -0400  
From: "Rusi P. Taleyarkhan" <rusi@purdue.edu>  
To: Robert Service <rservice@aaas.org>  
Cc: [co-author list]  
Subject: Re: A few minutes? rpt->BobService-ScienceMagazine (5.10.07)

Dear Mr. Service:

I am away from campus and could not respond earlier but suffice to say I and several of my colleagues are appalled at the note from Rep. Miller for its lack of balance and single-minded fervor to posit a prejudicial one-sidedness. I will be able to talk with you next Monday if you wish but thought I'd share my views with you here. Feel free to contact several of my co-authors (cc'd to this message).

Basically, One must question:

- Why did this memo/letter from Rep. Miller's office intentionally omit ANY/ALL mention of the positive findings and supporting evidence from the many reports from Purdue Univ. committees that ultimately prevailed to have Purdue's peers and administrators make it's February,2007 decision to issue it's Press release concluding no misconduct and no need for further investigations? Why this intentional cherry-picking of points from the written reports specially chosen to portray a negative image? Is this the American system we are to follow, or is it just politics as usual? As written, the memo/letter essentially presents only the accusers points of view and passes it's verdict on the accusations.

- Why did this memo/letter completely disregard the mass of supporting evidence / information sent to it by me separately (including a statement to Congress) that essentially answered all of the accusations being levied with vitriolic fervor?

- Why is it that the same people/detractors who openly as of last December eagerly awaited Purdue's verdict on my work during the year-long reviews and examination of facts, only to then come out to challenge the same once the verdict was announced because the outcome was not what they wanted to hear? Smacks of sour-grapes and reminiscent of the political knee-jerk demand for a recount during political season.

- Fundamentally, why would Purdue administration want to side with me rather than the accusers, one of them who was an administrator himself who fell from grace for his many actions totally unrelated to bubble fusion? In fact, I am the one who has borne the brunt of the burden for extraordinary proof based on which Purdue made the Feb.2007 Press announcement absolving me of research misconduct.

- Why is it that per rules of engagement the requirements for confidentiality in State of Indiana's C-22 Process being selectively applied to me? Why is it that the illegal actions of some go intentionally unpunished even when they openly are defiant of the admonishments from the Provost and the rules we are all expected to abide by?

- By any stretch this transmittal represents a gross travesty of justice. Where are the Jesse Jacksons and Al Sharptons of the Asian community during this episode that has caused this biased and openly one-sided smear campaign?

Rusi Taleyarkhan