

**From:** Lawrence Krauss <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** "jeffrey E." <jeevacation@gmail.com>  
**Cc:** Lawrence Krauss <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Re: suggested email to the Provost and Kevin Salcido.  
**Date:** Wed, 05 Sep 2018 16:06:31 +0000

---

Mark no longer plays a role in this at all—it is up to the conciliation committee and the President.. and the President already knows Mark is a dope..., and there is not much downside at this point in merely asking questions and pushing back. Mark has already made his own cards quite clear.. I didn't do that at Case when I could have hit back, and look what happened. I didn't demand any kind of legitimate response at Perimeter and look what happened. So, this is simply a legitimate question I am allowed to ask. If I am further punished for this, or if it is answer the wrong way then it is more fodder for lawsuit. But if the conciliation committee reads the memos and decides the University acted inappropriately and I get my job back, the story for the outside world is still that the University found me guilty of something. So, I don't really see a downside, especially if I am polite and merely ask for clarification from both Mark and Kevin. I think it makes it clear to everyone that I am dotting all the i's and continues to.

LMK

more strategy on conciliation committee when I get word, presumably today, about its composition and plans.

**Lawrence M. Krauss**

**Professor**

School of Earth & Space Exploration and Physics Department  
Arizona State University, P.O. Box 871404, Tempe, AZ 85287-1404  
Research Office: [REDACTED]  
[| twitter.com/lkrauss1](https://twitter.com/lkrauss1) | [www.lawrencemkrauss.com](http://www.lawrencemkrauss.com)

On Sep 4, 2018, at 6:18 PM, jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:

i htought you wanted to keep your job.? it is for the conciliation commitee or the hearing. I dont see the strategy for the appeal . ? i am not a bad guy? one person said the other person didnt see. . what exactly does the case university letter say . contact? notify ask permission?

On Tue, Sep 4, 2018 at 9:06 PM, Lawrence Krauss <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi.. Here are some emails I am thinking of sending. Since Kevin Salcido is Carla's boss I should have cc'd him originally anyway. But since he outlined the process in detail I think I should write him the letter below. I think I should write Mark with 2 questions, see my letter to him below, and attach my email to Kevin. I was a bit worried about antagonizing Mark, but I think the letters are polite and he has already decided to fuck me over anyway. So, thoughts?

First, suggested email to Kevin:

1. Dear Kevin:

On Oct 29th and 30th I sent two memos to Carla Mahnke listing new evidence related to the matter associated with the allegation of groping in Australia. The first bit of new evidence not only casts additional doubt on the claims of the chief witness in that event (and suggests that the second witness was not a witness at all). The second definitively shows that ASU did **not** support any of my travel to the Skeptics event, and

obviates the claim that it was an ASU sponsored and supported event. As I indicated to Carla, I believe this new information warrants re-opening the matter as per your email to me of March 20th, from which I have extracted the relevant parts below. I haven't heard from Carla on this, and didn't know if she had forwarded my memos. Many thanks for your attention to this.

Lawrence Krauss

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Kevin Salcido (HR)"  
**Subject:** RE: clarification - my commitment to the investigation  
**Date:** March 20, 2018 at 4:50:06 PM PDT  
**To:** Lawrence Krauss <[REDACTED]>, Carla Mahnke <[REDACTED]>

Professor Krauss,

The Office of Equity and Inclusion reports up to me in my role as Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer for the University. I have received and read your emails from March 9, 19 and 20<sup>th</sup> noting your question on the basis for OEI to re-open its review of the complaint that was received last fall over alleged conduct at the 2016 Skeptics Conference in Australia.

.....When new information is received on a matter that was not previously available, OEI will re-open the matter so that a determination can be made on whether the original conclusion stands or if a different conclusion is warranted. (ACD 401 does not impose any time limitation on when complaints may be brought forward to that office.)

Second, suggested email to Mark Searle.

2. Mark,

Thanks for your email. I came away from it a bit confused about two items.

Item 1: Does this mean that the Dean is the "other party", i.e. the accuser, in this case as there is no complainant?

Item 6. I was confused by this answer and the process of re-opening the investigation. In your Sept 7th, 2017 email to me you say "While I realize that it's uncomfortable being the subject of an investigation, the process also protects you; you were cleared. Should any additional complaints regarding that episode come to us, we will simply indicate that", which suggests to me that I was the subject of an investigation, whose depth was only limited by the limited evidence at hand (given the Oct 6, 2017 memorandum report from Carla Mahnke at the OEI to you). First, I therefore don't understand the difference between investigation and inquiry, terms which you used interchangeably in that email. As you may recall, your email to me was the reason I was later surprised that the investigation was reopened in March as a result of precisely what you indicated I was protected from, namely additional complaints regarding that episode. When I wrote to the OEI about this concern, I received a memo back from Kevin Salcido, which I believe was clear on this matter. I attach an extract from it below.

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Kevin Salcido (HR)"  
**Subject:** RE: clarification - my commitment to the investigation  
**Date:** March 20, 2018 at 4:50:06 PM PDT

To: Lawrence Krauss <[REDACTED]>, Carla Mahnke <[REDACTED]>

Professor Krauss,

The Office of Equity and Inclusion reports up to me in my role as Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer for the University. I have received and read your emails from March 9, 19 and 20<sup>th</sup> noting your question on the basis for OEI to re-open its review of the complaint that was received last fall over alleged conduct at the 2016 Skeptics Conference in Australia.

.....When new information is received on a matter that was not previously available, OEI will re-open the matter so that a determination can be made on whether the original conclusion stands or if a different conclusion is warranted. (ACD 401 does not impose any time limitation on when complaints may be brought forward to that office.)

---

I have written to Kevin Salcido for clarification about this issue as I had not heard back from Carla Mahnke about it. I am hoping he can further clarify why the new information I provided to Carla doesn't warrant reopening the investigation as per his March guideline, if indeed that is the case.

Thanks again for your attention to these issues.

Best

Lawrence

attachment: Letter to Salcido from item #1

**Professor**

School of Earth & Space Exploration and Physics Department  
Arizona State University, P.O. Box 871404, Tempe, AZ 85287-1404

Research Office: [REDACTED]

| [twitter.com/lkrauss1](https://twitter.com/lkrauss1) | [www.lawrencemkrauss.com](http://www.lawrencemkrauss.com)

--

please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to [jeevacation@gmail.com](mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com), and

destroy this communication and all copies thereof,  
including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved