

Eugenie Reich wrote:

Dear Professor Taleyarkhan,

I received a press release yesterday from Purdue and will write a short story about the denial of your appeal for Nature. Do you have any comment you'd like to contribute? Do you expect that this sanction will affect your ability to continue work on bubble fusion?

Best Wishes,

Eugenie

Eugenie Samuel Reich
Science and Technology Writer
Cambridge, Massachusetts

T: +1 617 354 0329
C: +1 617 821 1538
eugenie.reich@gmail.com

Date: Thu, 28 Aug 2008 11:59:56 -0400
From: Rusi Taleyarkhan <rusi@purdue.edu>
To: Eugenie Reich <eugenie.reich@gmail.com>
CC: "Dr. Richard T. Lahey" <laheyr@rpi.edu>, "Block, Robert" <blockr@rpi.edu>, Colin/Suzanne West <herderwest@comcast.net>, jaeseoncho@hotmail.com, Yiban Xu <yiban@purdue.edu>, Robert Nigmatulin <nigmar@gmail.com>, rusi@purdue.edu, "Prof. Guenter Lohnert" <lohnert@ike.uni-stuttgart.de>
Subject: Re: request for comment Nature (rpt->E.Reich;8.28.08)

Dear Ms. Reich:

I got the paperwork from Purdue administrators yesterday afternoon surprisingly, after they released it to the Press. A few immediate comments:

The sanctions are unfair and egregious in their severity to defame as worse as feasible, but I was informed of this many months ago as the response that has to go out. Mr. Lewis should be able to clarify.

A key question that comes up is why did a duly constituted committee in

2006 looking at these same two issues exonerate me followed by a glowing Press Release from Purdue, only to find that, following political pressure from Congress (motivated by articles in Nature magazine) in early 2007 - then starts a new 2-y investigation, generates 34 distinct allegations from worldwide detractors driven by the need to investigate fraud/fabrication, then addresses-dismisses all these 34 duly entered allegations to the satisfaction of the federal government, but then enters "new" allegations against State laws governing such investigations - that too, the same ones it had exonerated for in 2006 from people who looked at the same information and exonerated without pressure from Congress? In the new investigative round of the past 2y several people from within Purdue have come forth with sworn affidavits highlighting severe associated occurrences of discrimination, reprisal, intimidation and the like simply not allowed in a US institution of higher learning - that too, committed by and condoned by Purdue administration. Incredibly, Purdue's attorney for this 2-y investigation served as judge and advisor on managing the events despite him having been conflicted and who conveyed threats of punishment from Purdue depending on level of cooperation (left on voice-mail). Having pointed this out, Purdue still did not release him from managing and controlling this Appeals process. The attorney in question passed the crucial judgments critical to the outcome. The Appeals document itself incorporates significant omissions and incorporates wrong information - all to justify and support the prior decision publicized prematurely in a Press Release of a few weeks ago. My attorney (John Lewis) has initiated a civil lawsuit.

The two surprisingly new (Purdue-fabricated) allegations for which misconduct was concluded have nothing to do with the science of bubble nuclear fusion. All legitimately submitted 34 submitted allegations many on fraud and fabrication have been dismissed as invalid and without merit – thereby, for our bubble fusion team, this further supports the underlying science as being valid, the results of which have been successfully replicated already several times and archived in journal, in international conferences, reports and testimonials to Purdue.

There is now a fork in the road to head down. The matter at Purdue University is something that will be addressed, but will no longer affect bubble fusion research as the final two allegations have nothing to do with the science, which, as a consequence of this overall ordeal has been further vetted and strengthened in terms of it's credibility. For the science of bubble fusion, this 3-y long investigation was a success. As a faculty member and US citizen, I have a right to appeal the findings by Purdue University in this matter along with seeking redress for the extensive damage caused to me and several others from the Courts of the United States. The university system has failed

miserably and taken the expedient way out. The sanctions are politically-motivated to respond to Congressman Miller who chastised Purdue's President in 2007.

Finally, this whole sordid matter started with a series of articles published in Nature (3/8/2006 by yourself) which imputed fraud and fabrication for the results of bubble nuclear fusion from the team of Oak Ridge National Labs./Purdue University (Taleyarkhan, West), Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (R.Lahey, R.Block), the Russian Academy of Sciences (R. Nigmatulin) and Seoul Natl.Lab-FNC Tech. (Cho). Unfortunately, you were convinced to highlight these allegations based on a non-peer reviewed web-posting computer calculation for an imagined experimental setup by UCLA (Naranjo, Putterman) coupled with comments from UiUC(Suslick). Obviously, you found the congregation of information offered to you from my team's well-known detractors as compelling at the time but that was inappropriate. A new seminal publication (vetted and peer-reviewed over 2 years) has just been released (attached - see the Abstract last para.) in the nuclear industry's premier technical journal Nucl.Engr.Design and confirms that the UCLA charges and inuendo are wrong (even deliberately so because they were told and should have been aware of various issues before your publication but still went ahead nevertheless). It says a lot for the time honored tradition of anonymous peer reviews and "then" publication in archival avenues.

The series of circumstances have concluded in my being charged for two trumped up areas of little scientific relevance. Voices and letters of protest and sworn affidavits from colleagues and co-authors who deliberately took responsibility for the actions for which I alone was singled out as guilty from all over were simply thrown out by Purdue's attorney and administration. Evidently, they knew what conclusion was to be derived leaving little recourse but the court system. Why else would they issue a Press Release a few weeks ago "before" the Appeals process could be undertaken? Your own article pointed this out as odd as also during our phone conversation (between you along with attorney John Lewis and myself).

Forgive the tone of the above, but one can't help but speak out under the circumstances and on behalf of my co-authors who have suffered through this sordid situation, we hope you will take responsible steps to correct and update the record. This sort of treatment can not be tolerated in a US university - it could happen to virtually any other faculty member. Administrators at any level must be held accountable and not allowed to engage in expediency.

For further input or clarification I have to ask that you contact my attorney Mr. John Lewis; pl. feel free to contact my coauthors. They

stand by our unified firm conviction that the two issues cited as misconduct have no basis, are wrong in their interpretation and the sanctions leveled are grossly inappropriate. Perhaps someone like you ought to interview the 2006 Investigation Committee members who, after several months of investigation had decided to exonerate for the same two charges I have been singled out as guilty.

Your colleague Steve Krivit of New Energy Times has written a thorough article clarifying the record of the interwoven complex issues in his book/report (attached).

Sincerely,

Rusi Taleyarkhan