

TO: Carla Mehnke, OEI

From: Lawrence M. Krauss

Reopen Investigation into Australian Skeptics Meeting allegation

I am writing to ask you to reopen your investigation yet again, on the basis of new evidence. At least two crucial new pieces of evidence now exist:

1. The photograph in question, allegedly showing me reaching for the breast of an identified woman has been analyzed and actually shows my hand and arm reaching *away* from the woman. It thus does not provide any supporting evidence for the claim, and also further impugns the credibility of Melanie Thomson, who submitted it. (Also, it is clear from my face, when compared with 10,000 other selfies you can find online, that I am not ready for the selfie in that photo.. No smile.. And if this photo occurred after any accidental touching rather than before as claimed, there is no evidence of shock or leer on my face.).
2. Melanie Thomson recorded a podcast after ASU released the results of your investigation, which she subsequently released to the press. Here is the link (<http://files.secretagencies.com.au/Episode112.mp3>) On that podcast:
 - a. She admits, contradicting her earlier claim, that the motivation for ultimately submitting this claim was NOT the event in question, but her objection to something I said six months later that she read or heard, and with which she disagreed, deciding I needed to be punished. Thus admitting not only malice in her intent, but also further underscoring that at the time the claimed transgression didn't rise to the level of raising a complaint, even for her.
 - b. She admits to meeting and colluding with other claimants, flying to the US to meet with the young woman from CWRU who lodged her own false claim there, and equally important she points out that in preparing the claim to ASU "WE worked with BuzzFeed", indicating collusion once again with her supporting claimants.

As a result of these factors, the photographic evidence needs to be dismissed, and the credibility of the chief witness further diminished, with the likelihood of collusion with the other claimed witness increased. Thus, all that remains is the testimony of the anonymous woman herself, who essentially corroborates my claim that the interaction, if it occurred at all, was a clumsy accident, for which she did not feel victimized and not worthy of reporting to you or being disciplined for. Not only this, but I remind you that this woman insisted on remaining anonymous, so as you have indicated to me, her testimony that this even happened cannot be given full weight.

As a result of this new evidence, it is clear that “it is more likely than not” that any possible touching that occurred associated with the selfie in Australia was at most accident, and not intentional, and clearly not sexual in intent.

I recognize the potential embarrassment for you to reverse your determination, and the new evidence should compel you to do. But, it is reasonable to say that on the basis of new evidence, you have changed your conclusion. After all, you have already done this once before.

I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience with a new determination.

Lawrence M. Krauss