Dear Sir,

I refer a letter published by Dr. Vezzoli in the current issue of your journal he claims priority back to 2001 for an explanation to certain gravitational phenomena, which were first recorded by me and my co-workers at my laboratory. Clearly, Dr. Vezzoli is mistaken to think that he was the first person to propose, in 2001, an explanation of the gravitational phenomenon recorded by me and my co-workers, at my laboratory. We in fact understood the phenomena in the same terms as much as 20 years before that, in the 1980’s, as numerous publications [1–17] testify. For instance, an explanation of the experiments was given by me in 1989 at the International Congress on Geo-Cosmic Relations, in Amsterdam [4, 5]. This explanation was repeated in the other papers, published by us in 1989, 1995, and 2001. Our data, obtained during solar eclipses, began with the eclipse of July 31, 1981, when a large series of measurements was processed by 30 experimentalists connected to my laboratory, located at 10 geographical points stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific (Sakhalin Island) along the corridor of the eclipse. We got more than 100,000 single measurements of the speed of chemical reactions during that eclipse. Our results were published in 1985 and 1987 [2, 3]. Since 1981 we processed measurements obtained during many solar and lunar eclipses, and also Full Moon and New Moon phases. The results were published in part only because a detailed analysis was required. In 1989 I published a paper wherein I claimed an observed change in the form of histograms obtained from a radioactive decay which was dependent upon the position of the Moon over the horizon [6]. This effect was observed at different geographical points. In the same paper [6] I suggested a gravitational origin of the observed effects.

I was pleased by the fact that a suggestion similar to that of mine was given by our American colleagues (Dr. Vezzoli, Dr. Lucatelli, and others), 20 years subsequent to me. This is despite that fact that their conclusions were made on the basis of scanty experimental data, in contrast to our own.

Dr. Vezzoli’s claim to priority in this research, and hence his intellectual property, is I feel due to the following circumstance: the absence of information in the West about most publications made by us during the 1980’s, in the Soviet (now Russian) scientific journals. I provide a list of my early publications, refuting Dr. Vezzoli’s claim to priority. In a letter published by Dr. Vezzoli in the current issue of your journal, he claims priority back to 2001 for an explanation to certain gravitational phenomena, which were first recorded by me and my co-workers at my laboratory. He claims priority to me on the basis of the fact that he shared his results and plans with me in 2001 in private communication. However, I and my co-workers understood the phenomena in the same terms as much as 20 years before that, in the 1980’s, and discussed by us in numerous publications during the 1980’s, in the Soviet (now Russian) scientific journals. I would be most reasonable from any standpoint.

I am responsible for a huge volume of experimental data, resulting from decades of continuous experimental research carried out by myself and dozens of my co-workers. I wouldn’t like to dilute the data with a survey on hypotheses and theoretical propositions given by the theoretical physicists. Frankly speaking, I have no obligation to give such a survey. I am prepared to provide references to published papers on the subject, if it is suitable according to contents. However I feel that it is wrong to refer any information obtained in private communications before they publish their views on their own account.

I give below a list of my early publications, which refute the claim made by Dr. Vezzoli. Even a cursory inspection of the publications reveals the fact that the information provided to me by Dr. Vezzoli and Dr. Lucatelli wasn’t news to me. I do not wish to be embroiled in any quarrel with them. However, having the list of my early publications, it would be strange to raise the issue of priority.
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Unfortunately, no definite theoretical explanation of the phenomenon we observed [1–16] was published in the scientific press until now. The authors of a series of papers, published in 2001 in Biophysics, v. 46, no. 5, presented different hypotheses on the subject. Not one of those hypotheses resulted in a calculation which could be verified by experiment.
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