

Adams, Holly

From: (b) (7)(D)  
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2005 11:33 AM  
To: (b) (7)(D)  
Subject: Re: Stanford GCEP meeting

(b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

January 14, 2004 (b) (7)(D)

1. Unauthorized dismantling of (b) (7)(D) apparatus in the Pharmacy building in Spring of 2004 (which made it difficult to proceed with further experimentation?).
2. Disappearance of (b) (7) 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.

(b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D) 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 (b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

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

(b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D) 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. (b) (7)(D) > uncertainty of the results and (b) (7)(D) the difficulties of > running the experiment because of loss of experimental materials and > other matters. (b) (7)(D) > 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

(b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

0668

44

> characterizing the work in this manner on January 14th, 2005. (b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

> and retention of Professor Talevarkhan to Purdue, at your strongest

> urging. (b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

> Starting today, unless I hear otherwise from you, (b) (7)(D)

> working on any matter related to the controversial research that (b) (7)

> have characterized as involving "experimental sloppiness, poor

> analysis, and even poorer ethics." (b) (7)(D)

> controversial and equally exciting opportunities in the field of

(b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

\*Sent: Fri 11/18/2005 12:47 AM

(b) (7)(D)

> \*Subject: Re: Stanford GCEP meeting

(b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D) caution, with all (b) (7)(D) on sonofusion. It appears  
> that experimental sloppiness, poor analysis, and even poorer ethics  
> may be involved.

(b) (7)(D) that on January 14, 200 (b) (7)(D)

> discussed the results of independent experiments conducted by the  
> School of Nuclear Engineering aiming to confirm Talevarkhan's findings  
> published in Science (3/8/2002). Our conclusions were clear and  
> categorical. There is no evidence whatsoever of tritium production and  
> therefore (contrary to what has been claimed) no signature for  
> thermonuclear fusion. The Purdue experiments were very  
> well-conducted, with very good statistics and thorough analysis of  
> results.

(b) (7)(D) withdrew a paper describing Purdue's independent  
> experiments and findings entitled "TRITIUM MEASUREMENTS IN ACOUSTIC  
> CAVITATION NUCLEAR EMISSION EXPERIMENTS," accepted for publication in  
> the 11th International Topical Meeting on Nuclear Reactor  
> Thermal-Hydraulics (NURETH-11), Avignon, France, October 2-6,  
> 2005 (Paper 455).

(b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

0669

45

> (b) (7)(D)

> (b) (7)(D)

> > To guide GCEP in their defining strategies for breakthrough  
> > research. At this meeting, a DARPA Program Manager told (b) (7)(D)  
> > Putterman (UCLA?) has told him that acoustic inertial confinement  
> > fusion is definitely realizable in an experiment within a few years.  
> > (b) (7)(D) just is not sure (and I guess he has company) that Rusi  
> > has demonstrated it. Suslick has measured plasmas and says that  
> > even though fusion is far from realized the mechanism of heating by  
> > confinement does not have a theoretical limit.

> (b) (7)(D) consider revising (b) (7)(D)  
> > approach towards Rusi from optimistic but informed scpeticism to  
> > optimistic, informed investment to quickly get to bottom of things?

(b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D) \*\*\*\*\*

(b) (7)(D) \*\*\*\*\*

0670  
46