

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 that it was taken showing me reaching out, 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, "I lost my mind"
 - b. She then colluded with the young woman from Case in framing her complaint (this woman was not at the event or in the same hemisphere) who told her what to argue for and what to expect. Melanie was thereby admitting to being coached in her claim by others.
 - c. Both a and b demonstrate the claimed transgression didn't rise to the level of raising a complaint, even for her, and that her complaint was motivated by other interests, pressures, and collusion.
 - d. She makes it explicitly clear that she made no complaint at the time.
 - e. Dr. Thomson she told the woman in the second selfie, taken a day after the event in question that "she hated me", demonstrating clear malice.
 - f. She admits to meeting and colluding with other claimants, to 'send a message', not simply to report an incident. She points out that in preparing the claim to ASU "We managed to get people together with BuzzFeed", implying strong collusion.
 - g. She states the other witness Michael Marshall *did not* witness the breast touching itself, countering the claim made to you. She says explicitly she was the *only* eye-witness to the event.

In light of these factors, all that now remains is the testimony of the anonymous woman herself—whose insistence on remaining anonymous is telling—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.

As a result of this new evidence, I believe 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 believe it is reasonable that on the basis of new evidence, for you to change 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