

Quoting Kenneth Chang:

Dear Dr. Taleyarkhan:

I am writing an article for Friday's paper about the letter to Purdue from the Congressional subcommittee on investigations and oversight. Copies of the letter and memo are attached if you have not seen them. In particular, I would like to ask you about the last year's inquiry which concluded there was no misconduct. The report, quoted in the memo, does say some very negative things about you. I was hoping to get a response from you. In addition, the memo and letter now say there is a new inquiry underway that is looking at the underlying research. I understand that you would not be able to say much, but I would appreciate whatever you could say.

Thank you.

My phone is (212) 556-7271.

\*\*\*\*\*

Date: Thu, 10 May 2007 21:02:47 -0400  
From: "Rusi P. Taleyarkhan" <rusi@ecn.purdue.edu>  
To: kchang@nytimes.com,  
Cc: [list]  
Subject: Re: Would like to talk to you about the Congr letter/memo to  
Purdue(rpt->kchang;5.10.07)

Ken:

I and several of my colleagues are appalled at the note from Rep. Miller. I am placing them on cc list so you can contact them if you wish.

Basically, One must question:

- Why did this memo/letter 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?

- Why did this memo/letter completely disregard the mass of public information and also supporting evidence / information sent to it by me separately?

- 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?

- 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