

**Morlan, Joyce J.**

---

**From:** Rutledge, Charles O.  
**Sent:** Monday, April 30, 2007 1:02 AM  
**To:** 'puherman@rltva.physics.ucla.edu'  
**Cc:** 'rpeccei@conet.ucla.edu'  
**Subject:** Response regarding Purdue's request

Dear Professor Putterman:

Your e-mail correspondence with Dr. Dunn has been forwarded to me for a response. I regret that you feel that our inquiry into research misconduct is not being conducted in good faith. Dr. Dunn is simply trying to accumulate sufficient evidence for new allegations of research misconduct in sonofusion research at Purdue. If it will help you to provide evidence to support these allegations, I will gladly answer your questions.

As a result of the federal government's interest in our research misconduct inquiry, new allegations of research misconduct have surfaced. An Inquiry Committee has been formed by the Dean of our College of Engineering and Dr. Dunn, as the Research Integrity Officer of the University, has requested information from a list of witnesses who we have been told might have information relevant to fabrication, falsification or plagiarism in the conduct or reporting of sonofusion research at Purdue. We have not requested information from reporters including Eugenie Reich because we are most interested in first-hand information by scientists who may have witnessed research misconduct and we are required to keep all information about a research misconduct inquiry confidential. This would prohibit us from offering to discuss this inquiry with reporters. If Eugenie Reich has information that she feels would be of value in our inquiry, she should feel free to submit it either to me or President Martin Jischke as she prefers.

With regard to your final question as to whether the use of methods that the community of scientists regards as reckless constitutes research misconduct, I suggest that you submit your concern in that regard to the Inquiry Committee so that they can make that judgement. I should add, however, that it is often a big challenge for an Inquiry Committee to distinguish between deliberate research misconduct that was intended to deceive or mislead from poor decisions and mistakes that were made in the conduct and reporting of research. Poorly conducted research is corrected within the community of scholars by fellow scientists failing to confirm the initial observations whereas research misconduct requires specific evidence that fabrication, falsification or plagiarism has occurred.

I have attempted to be forthright in answering your questions so that you would feel that the information that you provide will be used appropriately by the Inquiry Committee. I need to ask you to keep this correspondence confidential so that we can protect the integrity of our review process as required by our policy. If you have additional questions or concerns, please let me know. I will need the information soon since we are conducting this Inquiry in an expeditious manner.

Sincerely,

Charles (Chip) Rutledge, PhD  
Vice President for Research  
Purdue University  
(765) 494-6209