

From: Duane Thresher <[dethresher@alaska.edu](mailto:dethresher@alaska.edu)>  
Date: January 9, 2011 7:24:06 PM PST  
To: Greg Newby <[newby@arsc.edu](mailto:newby@arsc.edu)>  
Cc: "Lee Taylor" <[ltaylor@iab.alaska.edu](mailto:ltaylor@iab.alaska.edu)>, Claudia Thresher <[cthresher@alaska.edu](mailto:cthresher@alaska.edu)>  
Subject: Extortion by corrupt foreign professor

Greg,

An explanation of the extortion of my wife and me by a corrupt foreign professor.

I am cc'ing this to UAF Prof. Lee Taylor, my wife's graduate advisor. My wife, Claudia Thresher nee Kubatzki, already has a German doctorate in climate modelling but is going for a PhD here at the UAF in biology. The corrupt foreign professor has tried to covertly use Dr. Taylor and so he deserves an explanation but it would be unmanageable to custom explain the whole situation to everyone.

Dr. Taylor, I am Duane Thresher, Claudia's husband and an ARSC postdoctoral fellow, and Greg Newby is chief scientist and my boss at ARSC.

I will just start from the beginning. I'll try to keep it concise but it still won't be short so please bear with me. Except where noted I can provide evidence (mostly emails) for all of this.

Several years ago I went to Germany to work at the Alfred Wegener Institute (AWI) in Bremerhaven, Germany. I was invited by Prof. Gerrit Lohmann, the corrupt foreign professor, but it was agreed in advance that I would work extensively with Prof. Jelle Bijma on my project of modelling alkenone production, a sea surface temperature proxy, by phytoplankton. Unfortunately, Lohmann absolutely needed to be able to run climate models for the only projects he could get funded but he and his group did not have enough of that expertise, which I have a lot of. Further, Lohmann's English ability is remarkably poor so he cannot really author papers and cannot keep current in the field.

In short, Lohmann tricked me there and then pressured me in the extreme to run climate models for him, keep him current and work on papers for him. He did this to many of the people working for him, often easily-manipulated foreigners. It got so bad he was restricting my movements, requiring me to get several days advance permission from him to go work in Bijma's building a few hundred yards away and not often giving it. I protested, and after a lot of pretend "mediation" he fired me, knowing that without a job I would have to leave the country. Additionally, I came with an alkenone database I had spent years compiling and he threatened to steal it even after admitting to Bijma that to use it without my permission would indeed be stealing. I think (but have not taken the time to prove) he may indeed have published with it, without my consent, authorship or acknowledgement.

With then-girlfriend Claudia's help, a sympathetic (she was a romantic) German immigration agent extended my visa even without a job. Just a few months later Claudia quit her "permanent position" (an unheard of thing to do in job-scarce Germany) with Lohmann because of his unethical behavior, and not just toward me but towards her and other coworkers. I started a complaint against Lohmann but AWI would not provide me the requested evidence and did not pursue it and Claudia feared reprisals. Both of us tried to get other research jobs in Germany but could not. I am quite sure at least some of my rejections were because Lohmann covertly threatened others into not hiring me but I have no clear evidence (just some very questionable rejections). He did the same to Claudia but in one case, which led to the current situation, we have plenty of clear evidence. In that case, he threatened to sabotage the job evaluation of a junior professor, Ulrike Herzschuh, Claudia had successfully applied to work for. Herzschuh not only quickly caved in to Lohmann's threats and rescinded the employment agreement

but agreed to work with Lohmann. Claudia complained to AWI but Lohmann and Herzs Schuh easily convinced the AWI official to drop the matter. I found out only after I had been there awhile that AWI is not a highly-regarded research institution in Germany and tries to squelch anything that will make it look even worse.

Claudia and I were denied making a living in Germany, our money was running out, and still without a job I could not get another visa renewal so had to leave Germany. I was thrilled to get my current position here at the UAF working on a project I had been thinking about for years and came here but Claudia had to wait 6 months back in Germany for a visa to come to the US. She finally got one, we married, she became a US Permanent Resident, and we had our daughter this summer. We just wanted to forget the whole egregious situation in Germany and be left alone by the perpetrators (including Herzs Schuh), to whom we made it very clear we never wanted to have anything to do with them ever again.

We had no contact with them whatsoever and then at the end of last summer Claudia discovered that Lohmann and Herzs Schuh had in the meantime published a paper ("What caused the mid-Holocene forest decline on the eastern Tibet-Qinghai Plateau?") in March 2010 in the journal *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, using her name and work but without her permission or knowledge. The paper almost certainly would not have been accepted for publication otherwise and she subsequently found out that one of the offending authors, probably Lohmann, had pretended to be her to the GEB reviewers. Claudia contacted GEB's chief editor, Prof. David Currie of the University of Ottawa, who consulted with a Wiley/Blackwell publishing representative, Debbie Wright, in Britain.

Claudia demanded a retraction and she has been subject to months of ever-increasing intimidation since then, and now I am. Currie admitted upfront that he had negligently not checked the copyright transfer agreement, which was fraudulent, before publishing.

Both Currie and Wright clearly realized the reputation damage a retraction would cause, as did the offending authors. In fact, they initially refused to retract the paper at all and said all they would allow was for Claudia to make sure there weren't any scientific errors in the already-published paper! They also insisted Claudia be contacted by the offending authors even after Claudia refused right at the beginning, explaining the background and saying she feared intimidation, which is exactly what happened. Claudia also brushed aside all their abundant obfuscating tangential arguments and kept pointing out that this was just a legal matter, copyright infringement, and the paper must be retracted. They stalled and stalled but finally agreed to a retraction but then stalled even more, all the while facilitating intimidation by the offending authors, clearly hoping they could frighten Claudia into dropping the matter.

On and around Thanksgiving the intimidation became criminal. An email from Herzs Schuh spoke of being desperate over possibly losing her job due to the retraction and being willing to come to Alaska about it. This is a thinly-veiled physical threat and it was followed up by a bizarre email from Herzs Schuh's husband. I have asked advice about this from my younger brother, who is a special agent for the Department of Homeland Security.

About the physical threat against Claudia, a US Permanent Resident, (and perhaps me and my 6-month-old daughter, both US Citizens) from Herzs Schuh, a German, aided by Currie, a Canadian, he advised contacting the FBI, which we are looking into doing.

Then Currie forwarded an email from Lohmann mentioning me, damaging reputations and saying he had contacted Prof. Hajo Eicken here at the UAF and that Eicken has agreed to help him. Eicken, a colleague of Lohmann's, was at AWI and the University of Bremen, Germany, where Lohmann teaches, before coming to the UAF. Eicken, who works on sea ice (including its relation to climate), is a UAF full professor and in my field (climate), not Claudia's new field of biology. This is a thinly-veiled threat against me that fits Lohmann's modus operandi --- contact (usually phone) your employer or a superior at your

institution, speak badly of you and indicate there will be trouble for everyone if you are not squelched. This works remarkably well in Germany but I can not and will not allow it to work here in my own country. My fellowship ends soon and part of the idea of it was for me to get a more permanent position here at the UAF. Currently, hiring and funding at the UAF are probably the worst they have been in many years and I will not allow a poison pen threat to further endanger my future employment. Even if Eicken is not willingly agreeing to harm me, Lohmann may be extorting him --- Eicken may want to get a position back in Germany (coming to the land of opportunity, establishing a reputation, and returning to job-scarce Germany is a common recommended tactic there) and Lohmann might be able to make this difficult exactly as he did for Claudia and me. I must and will pursue this issue with the UAF and am informing you of that and asking for help.

ARSC is a Department of Defense facility and requires security clearance and training to be able to use its supercomputers. Before ARSC I was with NASA (GISS, in New York City) for years using their supercomputers and this too required security clearance and training, especially after 9/11 (a very scary time at NASA GISS). Part of this is reporting threats. Besides Lohmann and Herzschuh, one of the offending authors on the paper is Xingqi Liu, who is with the Chinese Academy of Sciences in Nanjing China.

Further, Herzschuh, from former East Germany, has worked extensively in China, including language training there. I do not know that this involves some spy conspiracy but it could look suspicious on the face of it, probably should be investigated, and if I don't report this threat I leave myself open to blackmail for not reporting it. Given my field I need to be able to work on supercomputers in the future so I will not jeopardize that ability. Lohmann in particular would jump at the chance to blackmail me any way he could. My brother, the DHS agent, suggested I could contact Defense Criminal Investigative Services about this DoD issue but was not sure and I probably should go through ARSC to do this reporting to DoD. I am thus asking for help to do that.

At this point Prof. Taylor will understand the "strange" email he got (14 Dec) from Lohmann and its purpose --- to threaten/punish Claudia. I should also inform him that Lohmann is bandying his name about, including with Wiley, saying that he is in contact with you and working together with you/UAF on the problem, implying that you/UAF agree with him. (Claudia and I know this is another of his lies and it is just him threatening her. She and I are sorry that you got sucked into this.) Bandyng about other researchers' names without their knowledge is also classic Lohmann. He may be doing this with Eicken as well. Part of the evidence I requested from AWI when I complained were Lohmann's proposals, which I strongly suspect list many collaborators he has never even been in contact with.

We can send you or anyone who wants to see them all or some of the abundant email evidence but warn you that there is a lot of obfuscating arguments to read through, often in very bad English, especially in the case of Lohmann, and while the threats are obvious once you know the background they are not blatant threats like in the movies. I attach two emails as examples of particular interest.

Lohmann\_22Dec10email.pdf:

Its email history is a chronological mess (Lohmann is sloppy in just about everything) that Claudia came into in the middle of but note first that there are 3 segments from Lohmann. In the bottom/oldest Lohmann segment (that Claudia did not receive when it was initially sent) and repeated in the top/recent Lohmann segment note:

"... her supervisor Dr Taylor at the new position in Alaska handed my email to her."

Then in the middle Lohmann segment Lohmann implies that he is working with the UAF (i.e., Dr. Taylor and Dr. Eicken) and also shows that the email is just a threat against Claudia's employment:

"I guess it will be ok to include [cthresher@alaska.edu](mailto:cthresher@alaska.edu), [kubatzki@o2online.de](mailto:kubatzki@o2online.de) as cc. ... Since we are working together with the University of Fairbanks, one may also think that her current employer and others should be informed about the process, also to avoid future complications."

Sue Joshua, a Wiley lawyer, has 2 segments in the email history and for a no-nonsense view of the situation these should be read in their entirety. They clearly show that Lohmann and the other offending authors are lying. It is too bad for everyone that Debbie Wright, the Wiley rep who took part in the intimidation of Claudia, did not contact Joshua sooner (or maybe she did and Joshua thought intimidation was worth a try as well).

Christoph Ruholl, an AWI lawyer, has one segment and this shows AWI again ignoring the law to protect itself. AWI tries to have the retraction undone by quoting German law but among other outrageous oversights includes "Claudia Kubatzki, as an employee, has the only right to claim not to be named as author.", which is all she is claiming, is what the offending authors violated, and is the reason for the retraction (again, the offending authors could not have gotten the paper published without her name; they barely could using her name).

Much of the rest of the email is nonsense from Lohmann, who continues to repeat it even after it has been refuted and dismissed by others in the email conversation: that the person making the complaint is not really Claudia, that because she did work for him before quitting in disgust (including three earlier similar papers submitted to other journals that Claudia did agree to but that were all soundly rejected and convinced Claudia that such a paper was not worthy of publication) he has the right to continue to use her name, that they tried to contact Claudia, and that he doesn't know about the law so it doesn't apply to him.

Lohmann\_25Nov10email.pdf:

This email includes his direct extortion threat against me:

"I assume that you are now Claudia Thresher (I guess from your web page). I wish you and Duane the best. ... I guess you are also not interested in damaging our and your reputation. A former colleague, Hajo Eicken <[hajo.eicken@gi.alaska.edu](mailto:hajo.eicken@gi.alaska.edu)> who is working in Fairbanks would be willing to speak with you (if you wish), and you can openly express your concern. He is a well-known sea ice scientist and he would be neutral and offered help in solving this problem."

Both Claudia and I left working for him very unamicably, including making complaints to AWI against him. It is ludicrous for him to say he wishes us the best. Then he just blatantly threatens our reputations. He mentions a well-known (so powerful) former colleague of his (Claudia and I have never met him), Eicken, here at the UAF working on sea ice (including in climate, my field), ludicrously insisting he would be neutral, and saying Eicken would be willing to help him with this problem (his "Thresher problem", as he calls it in the subject line of Lohmann\_22Dec10email.pdf).

Note also that Currie, the GEB editor, forwarded this and since Lohmann's attempt to hide his threat is bad, because his English is, Currie knew it was a threat but was continuing his abetting of the intimidation (we have many emails exchanges with Currie

and Wright that prove this). Further, as Currie says himself Claudia told him not to let the offending authors contact her in any way because she knew from experience it would just be intimidation. Yet Currie forwarded it anyway.

The rest of the email is the repeated Lohmann nonsense I listed for Lohmann\_22Dec10email.pdf.

Claudia and I are seriously considering publicizing this whole outrageous situation. We just wanted Lohmann to leave us alone and not making it public did not work, it only encouraged more abuse, so publication may be the only way. Moreover, Editor Currie and Wiley-rep Wright, stalled and stalled -- timing the retraction for after Herzschuh's 17 Dec AWI job review and all the while encouraging intimidation -- over the contents of a statement to be included with the retraction. Originally they insisted on including the irrelevant (since it is still not at all a valid excuse) lie that the offending authors tried to contact Claudia. She said the statement was ridiculous and they finally agreed to a very minimal statement. However, then they didn't even include that statement online (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2009.00501.x/abstract>), where most people would encounter the retracted paper, leaving the impression that Claudia might be guilty of something too. She only found out about the statement from Retraction Watch, after they contacted her about the retraction, which they wrote about at <http://retractionwatch.wordpress.com/2010/12/21/authors-plan-to-appeal-global-ecology-and-biogeography-retraction/#more-1145>. We think we might start publicizing at Retraction Watch. Judging from many of the stories there it would rank as one of the more outrageous ones -- amazingly unethical behavior (to put it mildly) from researchers, editors, publishers, and institutes -- and would be of great interest.

Duane