

TO: Carla Mehnke, OEI

From: Lawrence M. Krauss, Aug 28, 2018

New Evidence Regarding Australian Skeptics Meeting allegation

I am writing to bring to your attention new evidence that has come to light regarding this allegation, which should impact upon any finding. 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. Notice the ghost images caused by the movement trail to the right of my fingers, and also the ghost image of my jacket on my arm. It would be impossible to create these if my hand and arm were moving to the right—because the ghost images *trail* the movement, they don't go in front of it! This is thus not a photograph of me reaching toward the woman's body, but rather moving it *away* from her. Other colleagues who have confirmed this analysis. The photo itself is not evidence of my reaching to grab anything on the woman. **It thus provides no evidentiary support for the claim that I grabbed this woman immediately after this photo. Claiming the opposite is false.** The only evidence it does provide is:
 - a. The woman in the photo was leaning back against me at the time she took the selfie
 - b. Quoting from the ASU Investigative Report: "Thomson described that she witnessed Respondent, 'reach over her [anonymous female's] right shoulder and clamp his right hand firmly on her right breast moments *after* she [the anonymous female] took the photograph'" (emphasis mine). As you can see, that's not true—at the time the photo was taken, my hand was not touching her, and it was moving away, towards me.
2. Melanie Thomson recorded a podcast after ASU released to her the results of your investigation, which she then immediately 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. In particular:**
 - a. She revealed that what prompted her complaint to ASU was not the incident in question, but rather personal disagreement with something she thought I said about science advocacy, many months later. She admits to being cajoled by a woman previously associated with Case Western Reserve University in the US, who directly contacted her in response to a blog in April 2017. She also admits to being coached by that woman regarding expectations for the eventual complaint. Furthermore, she admits to colluding with other witnesses to send a message, not simply to report an incident. She states that in preparing the claim to ASU, "WE managed to get people together with BuzzFeed."

- b. 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 that there is a photo with my hand on the woman’s breast—a claim she repeated to the ANU investigators but could not substantiate when ANU investigators asked her to produce the photo. This blog further demonstrates willingness to embellish or lie.
<https://drmelthomson.wordpress.com>
4. A witness contacted by ASU after Melanie Thomson submitted a second selfie to Erin Ellison, which she incorrectly 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 bias at the very least. Melanie did not refer to any selfie taken the day before when making that statement, and it confirms a deep prejudice against me that, as far as I am aware, was not adequately taken into account in your earlier investigation.
5. In the interim I recently received an email from someone at the event claiming to see no inappropriate behavior at the banquet that evening and stating that I was a perfect gentleman who tried to meet and greet as many people as I could in the short time I was there. A copy of that email resides with the President’s office.

This new information should increase your reliance on the two actual participants in the event: myself and the anonymous woman in the photograph. The woman essentially corroborates my claim that whatever interaction may have occurred associated with the selfie was a clumsy accident that did not make her feel victimized and that she did not deem worth reporting to you.

I believe that this new evidence is sufficient to cause you to change your determination about the likelihood of a possible violation of University Policy. Having already done this once before in this matter 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 have occurred associated with the selfie in Australia was accidental, and not intentional, and not sexual in nature.

I look forward to hearing from you or the Provost at your earliest convenience.