

TO: Carla Mehnke, OEI

From: Lawrence M. Krauss, Aug 27, 2018

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 three crucial new pieces of evidence now exist:

1. An analysis of the photograph that Melanie Thomson submitted with her claim, which she stated occurred moments before I allegedly touched the breast of the woman in the photograph, actually shows my hand and arm *moving away from the woman*, not toward her. **It thus provides no evidentiary support for her claim, and moreover demonstrates this is a false claim.** It thus provides no support at all for the claim of accidental or intentional touching. The only evidence it does provide is;
 - a. The woman in question was leaning against me at the time
 - b. Melanie Thomson lied about what happened immediately after the photo was taken.
2. Melanie Thomson recorded a podcast after ASU released the results of your investigation, which she subsequently forwarded to the press. Here is the link. (<http://files.secretagencies.com.au/Episode112.mp3>) **On that podcast she lies repeatedly about various aspects of her claim compared to the information she either gave to you, BuzzFeed magazine, or in numerous other public statements about this event and also contradicts the testimony of the other witnesses in your investigation:**
 - a. **She admits that the motivation for submitting this claim was NOT the seriousness of the event in question**, but rather due to
 - i. her objection to something she thought I said six months later and with which she disagreed, deciding I needed to be punished. As she put it, upon hearing this, "I lost my mind". She subsequently realized that the words were not mine in a blog she updated (see below), but did not mention this in her podcast
 - ii. She also admits that she was manipulated and coached into making the complaint by a woman from Case Western Reserve University who first approached her after reading her blog of April 2017 (see below). Melanie admits to colluding with this woman in framing the form and content of her complaint.
 - b. She makes it explicitly clear that neither she nor anyone else made any complaint at the time.
 - c. 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 collusion with other 'witnesses'.
 - d. **She states the other witness quoted by ASU, Michael Marshall *did not witness the breast touching itself, countering his claim made***

to you. She says explicitly she was the *only* eye-witness to the event. Either she is lying, in which case this further impugns her testimony, or Michael Marshall was lying, which impugns his. Either way they cannot both be credible witnesses.

3. Melanie Thomson confirmed in the interview that her blog post in April 2017 is what initiated the complaint process. This post, which is defamatory, makes other false claims for which there is no evidence—including the claim that there is a photo with my hand on the woman in question's breast. This blog further demonstrates willingness to embellish or lie, and thus further undermines her credibility as a witness.
<https://drmelthomson.wordpress.com>
4. A witness contacted after Melanie Thomson submitted a second selfie to Erin Ellison at ASU which she claimed was evidence of photobombing, and taken one day after the event in question, reported that Melanie said of me at the time "I hate that man" suggesting malicious motivation for making a complaint.
5. In the interim I have received further email from someone at the event claiming to see no inappropriate behavior at the banquet that evening, (which confirms the statement of the conference organizer regarding his observations of the evening) claiming I was a perfect gentleman who tried to meet and greet as many people as I could in the short time I was there. I submitted a copy of that email to the President in my appeal of the proposed University disciplinary action as a result of this complaint.

This new information strongly discredits the significance of the two people who claim to be eyewitnesses other than myself and the anonymous woman in the photograph. The anonymous woman essentially corroborates my claim that the interaction, if it occurred at all, was a clumsy accident, for which she did not feel victimized or worth reporting to you.

I believe that on the basis of new evidence, it is appropriate to reopen the investigation to include this evidence, and be prepared to change your conclusion about the likelihood of a violation of University Policy. Having already done this once before there is already a precedent for this.

As a result of this new evidence, a reasonable conclusion would be that "it is more likely than not" that any possible touching that may or may not have occurred associated with the selfie in Australia was at worst an accident, and not intentional, and clearly not sexual in intent.

I look forward to hearing from you or the Provost at your earliest convenience with a new determination in this matter.

Lawrence M. Krauss