

**From:** Jacques Benveniste [jbenveniste@digibio.com]

**Sent:** Friday, October 03, 2003 1:40 PM

**To:** NSTC\_RBM

**Subject:** comments on biomedical research

Dear Colleagues,

Here is the comment that I just sent to Dr Zehrouni, Director of the NIH. To me the only question to ask is: "why is it that, in spite of the billions spent, no major improvement in major diseases (cancer, degenerative diseases, infectious and parastic diseases, immune disorders) has stemmed from fundamental research since a half century?" A lot of progresses have been achieved, but only from empirical or technological advances. I believe the answer is that the theoretical basis of current biology are wrong. Thus mechanisms must be found to allow non-mainstream provocative ideas to be supported. 99% of them will fail but the only hope is in the remaining 1%.

Now, if the US gov. still wants to put billions in such fallacies as gene therapy, a proven failure, and stem cells, that's just fine to me ;-).

Best regards.

J. Benveniste, MD, member AAI since '74 but resigned last year because of scientific censorship.

Dear Colleague,

I just stumbled upon the site <http://www.nihroadmap.nih.gov/> . Well, my main comment is: like similar previous attempts the roadmap is, in spite of all the good intentions, doomed to fail. There are 2 main reasons for this :

1) the basic principle on which biological research flourishes is wrong. The molecules, as central as they are, are not *per se* the final arm of molecular communication. We have shown in thousands of experiments that we can record and replay the specific signal of molecules (the word "signalling" is the most used in biology today yet nobody seems to bother to elucidate its physical nature) . Please see DigiBio's site below and US Patent no: US 6,541,978 B1. Date of patent: April, 1. 2003. Title: *Method, system and device for producing signals from a substance with biological and/or chemical activity.*

2) All these grant award bodies are faced with the problem of the "experts". Notwithstanding their competence and sometimes vested interests they are by definition the representatives of science as it is now and cannot be ready to accept real paradigmatic leaps. This is mainly why, in spite of the trumpeting, science, and especially biology, is at a standstill. Molecular biology has not allowed to make one theoretical avance and genetics does not provide any clue, as could be expected, on how the complex systems doswnstream operate. I published in Le Monde a large article in 1996 (attached since you are obviously fluent in french) showing that we are working under a Ptolemeus paradigm where astral bodies were linked with gears, when in fact biology depends on signals travelling at the speed of light, signals which, being in the Hertzian range, can easily be recorded, transported anywhere in seconds and replayed to the target, replicating the effect of the molecul e its elf. See [www.digibio.com/video](http://www.digibio.com/video)

When looking at NEW PATHWAYS TO BIOLOGY in the roadmap site, it is rather clear that little is "new" here. It's all good old structural biology that is to the real world what the poney express is to e-mail...

At your disposal for further exchanges

Sincerely,

Dr. Jacques Benveniste, AIHP, ACCP, Directeur de recherche Emérite Inserm. Directeur, Laboratoire de Biologie Numérique

*Jacques Benveniste MD, Director of Research Emeritus Inserm. Head, Digital Biology Laboratory*

32, rue des Carnets, F-92140 Clamart Tel : +33 (0)1 46 01 58 40 Fax : +33 (0)1 46 31 02 77 Mobile : +33(0)6 09 68 25 01

[jbenveniste@digibio.com](mailto:jbenveniste@digibio.com) - <http://www.digibio.com>

See <http://www.guardian.co.uk/Archive/Article/0,4273,4152521,00.html.htm>

and <http://www.weirdtech.com/sci/expe.html#qui>

**"Quand le fait qu'on rencontre ne s'accorde pas avec une théorie régnante il faut accepter le fait et abandonner la théorie".**

**"When a new fact does not fit with the reigning theory, one must accept the fact and drop the theory". Claude Bernard**

Cette imelle, confidentielle et réservée au destinataire, ne doit pas être divulguée. Tous les efforts ont été faits pour s'assurer de l'absence de virus, mais le destinataire doit le vérifier dès réception.

This email is confidential to the intended recipient and may not be disclosed. All efforts were made to keep this email free of virus, yet the recipient must check this upon reception.