

John A. LeRoy

References

1. My letter to Chief Scientist
Dated 19th Oct 2009.
2. Chief Scientist letter.
Dated 10th Feb 2010

Professor Penny Sackett.
Chief Scientist Australian Government

Dear Professor

I find the reply I received from your office extremely disappointing and lacking in any desire to understand my hypothesis on the process of “Life and Evolution” and the supporting documentation on various aspects involved in the life process. My papers demonstrate an understanding of the process and allow the causes of the problems arising i.e. cancer, diabetes etc to be established. The response I received fails to help me in any way to bring my findings forward or to assist me in having it assessed and it leaves me wondering, how you can ignore a legitimate explanation of life, and the possibility of doing away with extremely expensive and useless research programs of others because you now have access to answers that are in no way reflected in this research. It in fact leaves me further wondering why your office ignores my work despite it having professional support.

My letter to you indicated I am a retired engineer and as such I think it would be obvious I would have no contact or knowledge of a relevant “peer” group or a major scientific journal to submit my hypothesis to. Further I consider, based on previous experiences it would not be immediately acceptable to them, as it does not reflect very well on the professions involved, as it indicates the present research approach to the problem is illogical and this accounts for their inability to arrive at conclusive answers.

I indicated to you that physics, electrical, chemical and engineering phenomena are involved, in fact my finding is that life is a physics/engineering process, is purely mechanistic and this conclusion is supported by wide ranging experimental results and natural phenomena, the problem here being biologists and geneticists don't know what they are looking at. It is my experience that under normal circumstances the expertise of genetic researchers does not range across these disciplines, so the question becomes, where am I going to find this peer group? I approached your office therefore in the hope your group, involved in innovative scientific work, would appreciate the position and organize a technical committee capable of carrying out a professional assessment over the diverse disciplines. To test the situation as suggested by your office I inquired of a professor as to how I should go about organizing contact with a suitable “peer” group, his response. “I have no idea!” so the question remains, do you?

In an endeavour to overcome this impasse I am carrying on contacting overseas authorities, some of whom are already involved in similar research but falling short once again because of their lack of knowledge in the above disciplines. In short it appears to me, when the final results are known it will not reflect very well on your group if you continue to ignore this work and hand it on a plate to some overseas group, all for the lack of a little effort and common sense. I therefore plead with you not to insist on me falling back on the peer review process as this means surrendering in this particular case to mediocrity.

I appreciate the profession of Biology is well and truly imbued with the religious like belief that nobody outside of their profession can have an impact, and they resist change and cling to outdated dogma. The attitude that until a peer group review is completed, that the work should be to a required standard etc, etc surely strangles research if the field is new and consequently there is no group in the field conversant with the subject or educated to understand the involved phenomena. This situation is leading to stagnation in their work and research when concepts from a different angle are involved. This is a scandalous situation, as in fact in this case the answer is scientifically relatively simple and should have been resolved long ago. The implications however are far more complex and need immediate attention. This may seem harsh but just take the time to study biological theories and scientific journals and you will observe that only half baked ideas exist of the process of how a cell (all cells) functions, and that biologists merrily go along researching and believing there is no initiating input required to achieve outputs from cells and that genes are the controlling entity. What absolute nonsense, these concepts have a devastating impact on their work, and to make matters worse this has all gone through the "peer" review process!

I am supremely confident my hypothesis is correct and this, as I pointed out in my letter is supported by two professors, in fact it is three and others with a knowledge of genetics but above all it is logical and supported by every day physical phenomena and engineering facts and makes common sense leading to my final conclusions as contained in the updated version of the included paper (Theory of Life and Evolution), where it now extends in detail to resolving what compatibility with the environment is, what it means and how it is achieved and why. (A surprise here!) Also included is a revised copy of the paper "Epigenetics". This paper now demonstrates the complete futility of the researchers, worldwide who are stumbling along, at enormous expense, getting nowhere because they simply have no concept of the overall process they are working on.

If you disagree with this stance, then surely with your access to scientists you can establish one point of my basic hypothesis, by applying a degree of rigour, that is incorrect and demolish my theories. Good luck!

If you cannot achieve this then I think it behoves you to assist me in establishing my hypothesis for the benefit of the millions suffering worldwide.

Anecdotally you may be interested to know I approached two university students, one having completed his second year in biology and the second one having completed third year in engineering. After extensive discussion the biology student came to an understanding of the hypothesis. The third year student read the papers and responded instantly, "What's all the fuss about? Of course this is the answer".

Incidentally a thorough reading and grasp of the papers, which I am sure your group has not undertaken because of some points made in the response, would have revealed

some looming disastrous situations that for the government and ministers will eventually, have the potential to make the ceiling insulation fiasco look like small potatoes.

These are:

1. Exposure to fluorescent light globes (At close quarters, as in a reading lamp)
2. Exposure to mobile telephones (Over long and persistent use)
3. Exposure to sound energy from wind driven electricity generators
4. Persistent exposure to computer screen radiation where the type of radiation is not that normally experienced from the environment
5. Exposure to CAT scanning. (An example of taking a punt on peoples lives and well being, when not understanding or being fully certain of the consequences).

Note

It is not necessarily the difference in the strength of the radiation involved, but the difference in frequency and amplitude to the radiation normally experienced in the environment and the amount of time of exposure that causes the damage to erupt. This is due to the fact that pulsating forms of energy (Environmental) are the driving force of life acting on and generating responses from DNA and radiated energy impulses falling outside this range, cause dysfunctions to occur.

Evidence already exists that there are problems with the first three situations, however they have been dismissed, simply because the problem is not understood, by the experts who mostly have vested interests (I hope they had peer group support, when they made these negative decisions, see how farcical the situation is?)

Examples of the problems are 18 women suffering from breast cancer at the ABC studio Brisbane, and brain tumours occurring at an accelerated rate in mobile phone users. (Dr Charlie Teo).

There are other related genetic matters troubling society one of which is, as humans are animals, then when from aggressive environments may breed human "Pitbull dog" like offspring, hence thuggery. (See attachment re lion breeding). Similar events occur resulting in a whole range of personalities such as timid, clinically depressed etc. Another aspect related to the human animals is that young "pup" humans "gambol" and this applies to young car drivers and generally no amount of warning will sink in to immature brains, in relation to driving hi-jinks etc, some more then others, depending on inherited behaviour patterns.

There is strong scientific evidence that too rapid a change in an environment that members of a species are exposed to can have catastrophic consequences and where the human animal is bringing these problems down upon themselves by drastic migration patterns, physical and genetic mental problems can result (diabetes, asthma, clinical depression, allergies etc) not only due to the direct change of environmental exposure but to cross breeding as well resulting in mismatching of the evolved DNA (genes etc.). In other words there are drastic scientific problems involved resulting from uncontrolled migration for populations that we should be well and truly aware of and you as a scientific organization should be aware of and involved in.

The reasons for the above genetic problems occurring are all physical and mental characteristics of all species are due to the impact of environmental effects (energy

pulses), both direct and indirect, acting on the DNA and disruption to these effects can cause dysfunctions of the characteristics emanating from the response.

Your representative expressed his regrets at the loss of our son and this is appreciated, however the main concern should be centred on his two children, and the living million potential victims, worldwide, each year that suffer the BPD fate and this is what requires action. And this is just the thin edge of the wedge! And your office sidetracks the matter by suggesting confirmation by a non-existent Peer group!

If he had thoroughly read my papers he would have known I have a far greater knowledge of the real cause of BPD than the authors of these websites and that I was fully familiar with their work and left them in my wake years ago, after all this is where I started and then instead of relying on observations and experiments, I used my brains to get results. Also he should have recognized he could not and should not express unsubstantiated and unresearched opinion on inheritance (done parrot fashion) when obviously he does not understand the link between it, the environment and genetics. Yes, they are all totally interlinked and his comment is pathetic and is not the response acceptable from a scientifically orientated organization. This interlinking is the whole thrust of my findings and it just highlights the poor grasp geneticists etc have of what the life function is, and that I will not get a satisfactory input from a "peer" group of this ilk

The people responsible for the BPD website can only list symptoms and take stabs at what might work in their manual, because they have not questioned the how, why and what of the basis of the problem and gone back to the beginning. Presuming their work is subject to peer group review I am afraid it demonstrates the peer system does not have much going for it by scientific achievement that is further illustrated by the bumbling research and lack of real knowledge that exists on the functioning of stem cells.

Would I be correct in having the feeling your department is trying to fob me off, as just another non-scientific crank that just couldn't possibly have the answers because the professionals don't so don't waste our time! Or is it too difficult for your department because they can't cope with the theory and/ or the ramifications for the whole of society or are they dubious of the impact it will have with your fellow scientists? Or given I just happen to be correct but my work does not conform to prescribed scientific standards of preparation can it be justified my work be ignored? Do yourself a favour, take a red pencil and scrub out any thing in my papers that can be shown to be conclusively incorrect. I believe you will find it to be a couple of hours well spent.

It would be gratifying for me to see I had achieved a reasonable response from you and may I suggest you grasp the nettle and make your departments existence mean something and earn a respected place in society, so please do something of a positive nature and do not be chained by protocol.

Due to my age (80) I would appreciate a quick response to this letter as I find myself in the situation that I must impose time constraints on the progress of my work as, I would like to be able to make myself available for any queries etc. Therefore if I do not received a meaningful response in due course I will need to proceed with contacting further overseas authorities.

Finally may I point to two recent scientific documentaries appearing on ABC TV "Catalyst" (April 1st and 8th.) re Stem cells and the second "Stress, Portrait of a Killer" (April 8th). The scientists involved in these articles are all seen as on the level with geniuses and yet all display a lack of logic that I am prepared to demonstrate. (One of these is Australia's Elizabeth Blackburn a Nobel prizewinner!) To conclude this line of

thought, when professors Tregear and Zajac express interest and acceptance of my work, were they then inadvertently agreeing my theories were up on this level. Perhaps then you can see why I am reluctant to get involved with the peer situation and that it would be a real disaster for Australian science if you were to continue with your stance, of ignoring this hypothesis until it is accepted via another avenue.

Yours sincerely.

John A. LeRoy Dip N.A.

P.S.

As earlier stated I have already contacted overseas authorities and am virtually assured of a response from an American group, however if this was to fall through I would be forced, with no response from you, to open discussions with the likes of Japan, China, North Korea, Russia etc and given my hypothesis is correct and their previous knowledge, this surely would be a disaster for Western science. You can rest assured given their record, they would not be hogtied by the “Peer” group obsession.

Chinese scientists Professor Qi Zhou (Institute of Zoology Beijing), Professor Fanyi Zeng (Shanghai Jiao Tong University) and Japanese Professor Shinya Yamanaka (Kyoto University Japan) have to a degree stumbled onto the “what” they can do with stem cells but still have much to learn. (ABC. T.V. program “Catalyst” 1st April 2010). Their work is following in the same path as my hypothesis, but trailing, however access to my work would make it open slather for them and leave the rest of the biology research world floundering in their wake.

Attachment

1. “Theory of Life and Evolution” by John A. LeRoy (Updated and revised edition).
2. “Epigenetics” (Updated and revised edition).

Copies to:

Senator Kim Carr
Minister for Innovation, Industry, Science and Research.

Sophie Mirabella, MP
Shadow Minister for Innovation, Industry, Science and Research.

Producer, “Catalyst” TV Documentary
ABC Television.