

Hi Rusi,

It was very nice to meet you in D.C.

Can you please send me the e-mail from Eugenie on the day of the DARPA review and the report from the professor from Texas with names and identification blacked out at your convenience?

Thanks,

Steve

\*\*\*\*\*

Date: Tue, 08 Aug 2006 12:11:57 -0400  
From: Rusi Taleyarkhan <rusi@ecn.purdue.edu>  
Subject: Re: follow up Confirmatory Paper + Reich email transmittals to S.Krivit

Hi Steve:

Good meeting with you in DC last week also. Per your request I'm appending email communication documenting E. Reich's email question to me related to Brian Naranjo's allegations on the same afternoon of (3/1/06) that Putterman suddenly made allegations in front of my sponsors and demanded an immediate response - which I refused to give and advised him to write it up first with sufficient detail and send to PRL editors instead.

Earlier to 3/1/06 I had advised Reich also that technical questions needing clarification should be submitted to the editor of the journal for a thoughtful response per time honored tradition. Her questions were taking on a hostile tone and the radical proximity to Putterman's timing and locale for his allegations looked very suspicious to me and my team. It was clear she was working along with Putterman and others for some time. I did not respond to her question to comment about Naranjo's work which shockingly was published in Nature only a few days later on 3/8/06 without traditional journal-based peer reviews (incidentally, which is ongoing "now"). No one from Nature ever contacted me/team on their 3/8/06 articles and you will note that Reich identifies herself as a freelance writer.

Also, per request is the summary report from the Texas group (with names and university blacked out to respect their privacy as they go through peer reviews). This was a courtesy copy transmitted to me as it was prepared for sending for

publication/presentation; it may be revised per reviewer feedback the authors receive, and is for your information only at this stage. Nevertheless, the results are self-explanatory. Not only did this group obtain confirmatory data with two independent detector systems, they also conducted control experiments along with calibrations, etc.

I'd like for you to acknowledge receipt of this transmittal before you head off on your vacation.

Thx,

Rusi Taleyarkhan

(PS: I must let you know that due to personal finance situation (just can not sustain the charges of close to \$1,000/hour of lawyer fees from Duane-Morris,LLP) it is very likely that I will be staying without Duane-Morris LLP legal involvement in the near future. Their monthly fees are turning out to be XXXX and that is clearly not sustainable unless some alternative is found.

You can imagine the mental turmoil it causes to me and my family. We've never sued anyone in our lives nor have any experience with lawyers.)

-----Original Message-----

From: Eugenie Reich [mailto:[eugenie.reich@gmail.com](mailto:eugenie.reich@gmail.com)]

Sent: 01 March 2006 20:31

To: 'Rusi Taleyarkhan'

Subject: left message

Dear Dr Taleyarkhan,

I have left a voicemail. Would you like to add any comment or explanation as to why the simulation by Brian Naranjo appears to be so much of a far better fit to the spectrum of the californium fission than to fusion?

---

Eugenie Samuel Reich  
freelance journalist, science and technology  
Cambridge, Massachusetts  
phone: +1 617 354 0329  
cell: +1 617 821 1538  
[nasw.org/users/essreich](http://nasw.org/users/essreich)

\*\*\*\*\*

Rusi,

[SK] What was the result of the second audit by Tessien?

[RT] Nothing to my knowledge; he did not follow through as promised; very likely due to pressure from their investors. I've not questioned Ross after he left. BTW I have not mentioned to IDI about the work of the Texas group and Prof. Bugg (Stanford/UTK).

\*\*\*\*\*

Steve/Haiko:

I've talked recently with Coblenz and asked if he had commissioned Putterman to use the DARPA funds to perform modeling/simulations of my PRL studies which were done not with external neutrons but with dissolved alpha emitters. He denied asking for/approving this. As you will note, Naranjo in his PRL paper acknowledges DARPA sponsorship for this work from Putterman. Recall, the connection with the recent July Nature article and the charges.

I guess "Animal Farm" comes to mind here..

Rusi

\*\*\*\*\*

Date: Tue, 08 Aug 2006 15:53:16 -0400  
From: Rusi Taleyarkhan <rusi@ecn.purdue.edu>  
To: Steve Krivit  
Subject: Re: follow up Confirmatory Paper + Reich email transmittals to S.Krivit (rpt->s.krivit;8.8.06-2)

Steve,

All: Responses are in text of message.

Rusi

[SK] It appears that Reich had started asking you questions about your work "earlier to 3/1/06." If I understand correctly, her interest in your work with bubble fusion itself was not a new inquiry on March 1, but the matter of Californium was new, yes?

[RT] Correct.

[SK] Can you please tell me when the Naranjo paper went online on arXiv? Or otherwise became public knowledge?

[RT] March 8 as Brian pointed out. As mentioned this was brought up by Putterman in my lab. on 3/1/06

[SK] If the Naranjo paper was not public prior to March 1, is there any other conceivable mechanism for Reich to have learned of the Californium speculations besides the apparent one?

[RT]  
[No]

[SK] Can you please tell me details about the initiation of this DARPA review? When did you first learn of it?

[RT] Late Jan. 30, 2006 is when it was requested by Bill Coblenz

[SK] If you have a related document, would you kindly send it? What did they explain as to the purpose of the onsite review?

[RT] To review status of ongoing efforts at UCLA/Purdue related to neutron-seeded cavitation fusion expts. with deuterated acetone; to have my group show visitors how the test cells are put together from start, filling, conduct of degassing, shielding, neutron-seeded nucleation, shock properties and evolution, neutron measurement systems, discussions on protocol for tritium monitoring, ask questions on test cell construction including positioning of reflectors, etc.

\*\*\*\*\*

Hi Rusi,

Thanks for all the information.

Did Bill Coblenz inform you on Jan 30 2005 in writing or orally? If so, may we have a copy of that document? What were your thoughts as of Jan 30 about the news of the review?

Steve

\*\*\*\*\*

Date: Tue, 08 Aug 2006 18:57:51 -0400

From: Rusi Taleyarkhan <rusi@ecn.purdue.edu>  
To: Steve Krivit <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: Re: follow up Confirmatory Paper + Reich email transmittals to S.Krivit (rpt->s.krivit;8.8.06-3)  
X-ECN-Spam-Status: No

Steve:

I've strived to provide in good faith as much information as possible per your requests with documented facts not verbal allegations (per the package I gave to you in DC last week).

Let me comment on the 3/1/06 review. Although an onsite review is not something "I" myself had experienced with DARPA, my reaction at the time was ambivalent leaning towards being stressed. On the one hand, I felt unduly rushed since we were still making progress and were not ready to give a successful demonstration of the ORNL system expts. since new PZT drivers (a rather long lead-time set of components) had just about been delivered by the suppliers and systems were being put together and painfully tried out; the other self-serving aspect was the potential benefits to get a funding sponsor's attention for future efforts. The Jan. 30 date I mentioned from memory was meant to state around that time frame (i.e., in January, 2006 when I heard from Coblenz as my group's PRL paper.

I looked back at email logs and find that his email asking for a site review visit was sent on 1/11/06. We talked few days later and came to terms on what to expect and plan for around the end of the month. Coblenz mentions therein in his 1/11/06 missive that he wished we had let him know of this PRL publication so he would not be caught off-guard by his management, but that was our group's internal decision since DARPA had not funded that particular line of research, but more importantly, based on intensely negative past experiences with our 2002 Science and 2004 PRE publications, to keep from getting unsolicited interference and getting our paper potentially derailed from well-established detractors like Putterman.

If you recall, Putterman and Suslick complained publicly thereafter, that they were not chosen as referees for the 1/06 PRL paper but Marti Blume (editor-chief of Phys.Rev journals) stood his ground and went on record as stating the world has many other well-qualified individuals.

We for one, cannot recall Putterman or Suslick ever sharing any information of impending relevant publications with us over the years. Why should we be held differently?

In the past when DARPA indeed funded our work published in Science (2002) and Phys.Rev.E (2004), we ensured that the responsible DARPA manager knew

well before even the paper was submitted to the journal. We simply did not and do not trust Putterman and associates and see no need to apologize for this after all the grief I've gone through. Let the facts speak for themselves.

I will forward Coblenz's email of 1/11/06 for your documentary records as also look for email communication with Putterman of 2/8/06 discussing exactly what would be covered during the meeting of 3/1/06. You should also know that the DARPA project with Purdue ended officially on 2/28/06. They did not pay for my group's time and efforts on 3/1/06.

Rusi