Subject: Re: Stanford GCEP meeting
From: "Lefteri H. Tsoukalas" <tsoukala@purdue.edu>
Date: Mon, 21 Nov 2005 11:33:15 -0500
To: "Gore, Jay P." <gore@purdue.edu>

Dear Jay,

Thank you for sharing the success of the Energy Center with me and for the leadership you have provided in enabling it.

As for our January 14, 2004 meeting, again, with all due respect, I recall relating to you a series of problematic and perplexing actions by Rusi, including:

1. Unauthorized dismantling of our apparatus in the Pharmacy building in Spring of 2004 (which made it difficult to proceed with further experimentation?).
2. Disappearance of our samples (with the putative Tritium evidence; the samples turned out to be in his possession and miraculously reappeared after I threatened a police investigation).
3. Documented attempts by Rusi to bully Profs. Clikeman, Bertodano and the students into changing findings to appear like "confirmation" had been achieved.

Although the group had several meetings with Rusi and made him aware of some serious flaws in his tritium counting and analysis and pointed to mistakes in his overall experimental approach, he continues to try to put in the bibliography questionable papers claiming "independent confirmation" at Purdue (as you and I have discussed recently).

I would like us to meet and talk about this at your earliest convenience.

Lefteri

Gore, Jay P. wrote:

0785

Dear Lefteri,

Thank you for your advice. I will certainly hold judgment on this matter until the final results are out from multiple sources.

Lefteri, my suggestion for withdrawal of the paper you cite below was on the basis of information you provided that there was no way to re-run the experiments in that paper because the apparatus was disassembled and moved. My questions were about repeatability and uncertainty of the results and you shared with me the difficulties of running the experiment because of loss of experimental materials and other matters. I also categorically asked if you or any of the other authors of the paper had prior work in this area and/or intended to continue work in this area and participate in the final resolution of the controversy. You mentioned that this was not the case. Based on these facts, I opined that you should not proceed with the publication of the controversial conference paper in rebuttal of the controversial Science paper. Again, this was just my opinion.

Given the characterization of the work and the paper that you have given below, I have absolutely no reason to advice you to withhold the paper. I would never advice delaying of a publication that has results of "very well-conducted, with very good statistics and thorough analysis of results." I simply do not recall your characterizing the work in this manner on January 14th, 2005. Please feel free to publish it in an appropriate forum as quickly as possible.
Lefteri, I have worked with you on many matters including recruitment and retention of Professor Taleyarkhan to Purdue, at your strongest urging. I am sorry that your opinion and assessment of this individual have changed so dramatically in a short time. However, I still respect your opinion and your freedom to deal with your faculty and colleagues in a manner that is fair and just in your view

Starting today, unless I hear otherwise from you, I will not be working on any matter related to the controversial research that you have characterized as involving "experimental sloppiness, poor analysis, and even poorer ethics." I will turn my energy towards less controversial and equally exciting opportunities in the field of energy. In this regard, let me end with one of the more positive things that have happened in the Energy Center recently.

You can see below that an invention by Varma et al was honored as 1 of 5 Technology of the Year award by industry week magazine at

http://www.industryweek.com/ReadArticle.aspx?ArticleID=11007&SectionID=4
<http://www.industryweek.com/ReadArticle.aspx?ArticleID=11007&SectionID=4>

Best,

Jay