

EMAILS

**Email to John Ashcroft
Attorney General of the United States
USDOJ:Office of Attorney General John
Ashcroft**

Date: 05 September 2001

TITLE: FAILURE OF ASSURANCES

If lying to receive federal monies is not fraud, then the killing of embryos is neither unethical nor murder.

Failure of the U.S. Inspector General's Office Blocked Cancer Research.

Congress). Many people warned America of the terrorists before the World Trade Centre disaster but no one listened. Will you listen to concerns of another threat to your own health and safety?

On the 17th of Sept. 01, A.G. John Ashcroft said we need new laws to deal with technical crimes. Please review the material sent to the DOJ and the RCMP and answer the questions they were asked (but refused to answer). Do we need new laws or honest competent people to honestly enforce existing laws (not held back so to cover up political corruption) and standards? It is no good for Senator Richard Shelby, of the Intelligence Committee, to rail about "bureaucratic bungling" or "CIA-FBI-NSA debacles" (the horse has already left the barn), when the Inspector General's Office-Health and Human Services will refuse to enforce regulations, in effect blocking cancer research so as to cover up fraud in order to protect Yale University and foreign politicians. Unbelievable, download the evidence presented to the DOJ.

Many are "railing" about the CIA's dependence on "hi-tech" and avoiding the human element; the DOJ was given the example of the CIA traitor who was a Yale graduate and was warned by many people friendly to the United States, yet the CIA refused to act. I have gone to the IGO-HHS warning of federal violations and fraud and maybe more importantly (to the public), the loss of cancer research and the federal U.S. government can be proven to have entered into a conspiracy to cover up. The U.S. government blocked (they could have

Dear Attorney General, John Ashcroft:

Thank you for receiving this serious email which will be the opening page of a website. Both the Canadian federal police, the RCMP and the U.S. Justice Department were told that material they received would be open to scrutiny on the web by the international legal community and the public so they could make a concensus: and to ask for help. The RCMP did say the case could be re-opened for new evidence or other, while your Deputy Chief of Public Integrity, Jo Ann Farrington, said I was sincere in my beliefs. I believe I have been dealing with political corruption, which requires exposure and the public's

helped but for political reasons chose to block) cancer research. More Americans each year die of cancer than were killed at the W.T.C. Bureaucratic bungling and an intelligence debacle.

And about Yale's reputation, why isn't the CIA asking the Yale psychics to find bin Laden since the CIA (dependence on hi-tech) spent 100's of thousands of tax dollars funding "psychic spies" at Yale. If this wasn't wasted tax dollars the CIA-Yale psychics should have prevented the WTC disaster. They did not and now everyone is talking about the need for "old-fashioned" human intelligence. In this regard, please help.

The Attorney General, John Ashcroft, is directly contacted because of his public stand on his religious beliefs. It is no good to say the words, you must prove your conviction. My thesis acknowledgement reads, "to my parents who instilled in me an appreciation for honesty, hard work and a belief in God." I have stood by my beliefs and would not lie. Do you stand by yours? Will you lie? The questions everyone has been asked (and refuse to answer) are:

1. Would the U.S. governments give research monies for work officially described in derogatory terms (i.e., it is so bad it is shit!) unless it were lied to?

2. Is lying for federal monies fraud?

It is easy to claim faith when there is no threat, but when the Romans came for Jesus, his disciples forgot who he was. Do you? I would not lie; will you answer the questions?

The questions are important to society because I am a Reproductive Scientist and Reproductive Science involves Stem Cell research and President Bush is assuring the public by requiring foreign institutes to give ASSURANCES of compliance in order to receive federal U.S. monies. My case proves these assurances can be nothing more than deliberate lies. Does President Bush demand truthful assurances, or is he, like his predecessor, Pres. Clinton, willing to lie to the American people? The material has been presented to both federal police and cover up is alleged, but issues of public concern will be outlined.

Documented evidence proves that valuable cancer theories were blocked for 14 years to cover up scientific misconduct and federal fraud, proving all assurances given to the U.S. federal governments were false. The U.S. taxpayer does not give monies to block answers to cancer, but to find them. Now the U.S. DOJ does not want to enforce the law, to prove the fact that the realize that I have been blacklisted from following up cancer theories and other realize that I have been blacklisted from following up cancer theories and other research of medical value to the taxpayer in order to protect Yale and Waterloo Universities. Universities that would block research of value to cancer in order to promote scholarship fraud for research officially described as so bad that derogatory terms had to be applied must be held up to public scrutiny. To protect the reputation of Dr. H.R. Behrman, head of Ob. & Gyn at Yale the American public may be put at risk (read Addendum) just like the CIA protected the Yale graduate who turned out to be a traitor (and caused the harm to the "Pueblo"). The way to answer this question is to have Dr. Behrman's 1986 publications compared directly to the suppressed Greenhalgh thesis; and then the 1990 Riley and Behrman publications; and then the 1987 Cell Death Signal theory genetic expression material as explained to the Canadian Ministry of Health, compared to the 2001 Nature publication of the

executioner gene by the University Of Toronto group. Essentially cancer research was blacklisted for 14 years to cover up scholarship fraud at Yale University by the University of Waterloo (Canada). And the Inspector General's Office of the United States instead of protecting the U.S. taxpayers and American public, instead of helping cancer research, blocked it for bad reasons: just like the CIA.

Once more we return to the precedence of President George W. Bush: "Justice may take time, but I'm a patient man." This case is about justice so the deterrent value of the law will protect society from people who falsely believe that they are above accountability.

Please read the e-mail to A.G. John Ashcroft, especially the section on "Truthful Assurances" as the scientific community no longer believes in the need for or the urgency of truthful and honest research as both journals of Endocrinology in the U.S. and U.K. made bad decisions regarding plagiarism by J. C. Carlson and Masaki Sawada, especially since the Canadian Ministry of Health had officially classified the J. C. Carlson research in derogatory terms. Their actions to cover up bad and unethical

Canadian Government gave deliberate false assurances; and the U.S. Inspector General's Office covered up. The reason is to protect two rich, elite, universities: Waterloo and Yale. Point: If these institutes will give deliberate false assurances to the U.S. government, then why won't the foreign institutes receiving U.S. monies for Stem Cell research? And why won't the U.S. government cover this up too? After all, cancer research was blocked. What is worse: letting Americans die of cancer or killing embryos, as they are both a life? Fact: Reproductive scientists are proven to have lied to the U.S. government, giving blatant and deliberate (lies), false assurances for money. And to keep the money flowing, block research of value to cancer. Documented and proven!

Why won't the Stem Cell institutes lie to the U.S. government if you refuse to enforce the law? The law's only value is as a deterrent and if there is no enforcement, then the law and all the assurances in the

world (including President Bush's assurances to the American people and concerns over Stem Cells and the misuse) are useless. Is President Bush honest and respects the deterrent value of the law? The answer is whether or not you and he, will enforce the law. Again, is lying to receive federal monies fraud?

The Worthlessness of Scientific Assurances and Advice to Michael J. Fox

Nobel prize winner Kary Mullis has said that most cancer researchers are lying to keep their funding. I, myself, had cancer (like Lance Armstrong and Scott Hamilton) but used my theories, while turning down chemo and radiation, and will be considered cured as of 2002. Without any side effects or tumours. This research would have been valuable to Americans, but now they must consider the (black listing) rejections given by American Institutes: Sloane Kettering, R.A. Bloch, Carol M. Baldwin and Huntsman. Emphasize: Institutes. Emphasize: my theories are all vindicated while my critics' are described in derogatory terms.

What people like Michael J. Fox must learn from my case, is that researchers research and not help an honest and truthful researcher explains why Mad Cow Disease destroyed the British beef industry and HIV and Hepatitis C contaminated the world's blood supplies. What the world must seriously consider is the Addendum sent to the DOJ and if the Head of OB & Gyn at Yale can not tell the difference between "shit" and science; or does not even care as long as he receives grant monies; just how safe is much of the research in the biological tech-field? Especially if the American federal government refuses to enforce federal regulations.

Perhaps the very low level of scientific standards is best represented by the journal, Endocrinology U.S.A. and its lack of concern for the public health and safety (if they care or not), which is summed up in the attitude of Dr. Barker whose reply is paraphrased as plagiarism can't exist because J. C. Carlson was your "mentor"; and even if he is wrong and your concerns about cancer are correct, sooner or later someone else will discover the same thing

you have anyway. Endocrinology doesn't want to admit that there are bad scientists just like the army didn't want to admit their "mentors"-training sergeants were raping young women recruits. The U.S. army could only put their heads in the sand for so long: a public outcry helped. And Endocrinology's USA second part about cancer research as a "sooner or later" proposition must be an outrage to anyone who has lost a loved one to the disease. The truth of the matter is, had Endocrinology any real concerns for the American people a cancer discovery would not have taken until 2001. Maybe a cure could have been on the market, but Endocrinology USA was not concerned about the American public's health and safety but they appeared to be more worried about covering up for the Canadian government and Dr. H. R. Behrman at Yale. So the public should be very concerned because if a major journal like Endocrinology USA doesn't care, then a biological disaster as outlined to the DOJ in the Addendum is most likely to occur. The public health and safety is the issue and bad scientists represent a threat.

In the 05 Sept. 01 e-mail to A. G. John Ashcroft, there are concerns about governments and institutes, DO NOT honour assurances or standards, but they just want the money to roll in, no matter if people suffer and die. Since I had cancer, I do appreciate that Michael J. Fox wants a miracle, but unless he can have proof that the researchers are honest, they may just use him to raise money and let him become a helpless cripple. Sad, but I have dealt with many people who only want to use the sick.

How you can, Attorney General Ashcroft (and Pres. Bush) ensure that Michael J. Fox and others with his disease are not cheated, is by enforcing the law! President Bush supports the death penalty because it is a deterrent. People argue that poor innocent people have been executed. This case involves the rich elite (Marcus Rich is elite) of the Universities of Waterloo and Yale. Are they above the law? Please note that if you do not enforce the law, there is NO deterrent, and the institutes that you are giving Stem Cell research monies to, are the rich, elite of their countries. Why shouldn't they lie to you; give false assurances, because you will do nothing?

The University of Waterloo (Canada) gave deliberate, false assurances in a joint venture with Yale. They had to suppress cancer research, to keep receiving monies for dozens of outdated researchers. The new theory would have made a 14 year leap proving a great benefit to the American taxpayer. But they gave false assurances and the American taxpayer was cheated. Michael J. Fox, you want a miracle and are raising money, but what if the researchers go down the wrong path, while one researcher has your miracle, but it means the many will have their money cut off? Why should they tell the truth and help you? The proven fact from Waterloo and Yale is that they WON'T. To continue the funding, they will suppress your miracle. And they will do this because they have nothing to fear. The IGO is proven to cover up scientific misconduct and the DOJ will not enforce the law. Without a deterrent, no one has any fear of being caught lying. Which means assurances are patently false, and sick people will be cheated.

The Moral Issue of Stem Cell Research:
Killing Embryos.

"Truthful Assurances" as the scientific community no longer cares about honesty or standards have sunk so low that they actually can not tell the difference between the truth and lying; nor care if harm occurs, believing they can lie away accountability. What if the disaster is too big to be lied away, with deaths in the thousands, or millions? It is very similar to the Bin Laden disaster, for years the CIA simply dismissed human intelligence to be awed by "pie in the sky" technology-the scientific community keeps talking about would be wonders while tainted blood disasters occur. Truth is more important than would be marvels. The evidence actually proves that Dr. H. R. Behrman (head of OB. & Gyn. at Yale) can't tell the difference between "shit" and science; or does not care as long as he continues to receive federal monies. With this attitude, what good is he to the public well being? The evidence proves he is guilty of plagiarism and that the IGO-HHS instead of being a watchdog protecting the public by enforcing federal regulations, actually helped to block cancer research in order to protect him (not the public)! The IGO was derelict in its duty and

responsibility to the public, and the DOJ by refusing to enforce the law is covering up for everyone. And when government covers up wrongdoing, the public must be asked for help.

Blacklisting as Terrorism.

To use a quote by Pres. Bush but in a different context; you are either with the public good, or you are the enemy of the public good. What the public doesn't know can kill them; HIV in the blood supply, allowing American radiation workers to die in the 40's, 50's, etc. Politicians have condemned the WTC terrorists as dishonest and cowardly, not willing to act in the open. The scientific community, whom I have dealt with, is no better because their blacklisting, especially the cancer theories cause thousands of unnecessary deaths. Their blacklisting helps no one, but private personal gain. Bad scientists and journals must be seen in the same light as the Taliban, bad religious clerics are not representative of the good but they cause the most harm. Therefore in light of President Bush's speech good scientists What if Stem Cell Research does not pan out for, say, 14 years? What if alternative treatments could work and be developed sooner, but private interests can get rich, on genetically patented cell lines, from the embryos of paid call girls in the third world (like the black market in human organs) and these rich business people only allow the patented cell lines to be used in the U.S.? Please remember the trouble still lingering in the U.S. from the slave trade, where because of African civil wars, they sold their own countrymen into slavery. Does the U.S. really need this kind of problem? Will the U.S. let poor call girls sell their genetic patents? The issues are very serious and revolve around signed assurances, ethics and personal beliefs. My stand for my beliefs is well documented.

Not all reproductive scientists are bad or liars, but you are hamstringing the good ones. Why would anyone risk their career to warn about false assurances, if the U.S. government has NO intention of enforcing standards, regulations and laws. It makes no sense. So, why should the American people believe President Bush when he says he will receive signed

assurances about Stem Cell research? When has the American government ever enforced the expectations of these assurances in the past? My case proves this does not happen. What has happened is denial of wrongdoing, obstruction of justice by the very authorities whose duty is to enforce regulations to the point the authorities are AIDING AND ABETTING THE EVASION OF JUSTICE. Private citizens, if Signed Assurances were any good, shouldn't have to go the public for help. The issues are so serious when governments lie and assurances become merely propaganda. Some people are afraid that there could develop an international trade in dead babies. Ludicrous? No more than governments blocking cancer research so work described in derogatory terms could get federal U.S. monies. Is there truth to the Assurances, and a real deterrent. Please answer the question: Is lying for U.S. federal tax dollars fraud? Please note, no one in either the Canadian or American governments would answer that question. It is a very simple question. And what this case really breaks down to, is that elite are asked to speak up against academic terrorism-blacklisting so advances in science aren't held back.

Example: Silicon Breast Implants

In the controversy, studies funded by silicon producers found no harm to women, and a child testified to Congress that she would not be alive without the silicon shunt in her head. What is the truth and how limited should good scientists be in finding answers? For example, in the Ford-Firestone fiasco, do you concentrate on inflation or tire design or if outdated compounds were used: what is misleading and should a researcher be allowed to tell the whole truth to protect the public without fear of losing a career? So what is misleading with silicon may not be the chemical itself but its properties, an environment its physical nature creates. This is a more important question than dodging liabilities, valuable data in treating disease may be lost by a charade confusing the issues (like the universities of Yale and Waterloo have sought to create confusion and to dodge issues and accountability: i.e., is lying scientific misconduct). Women have complained of being sick and two groups of

doctors have two different answers. One fact (avoided) is that implants are removed black with infection: which represents important data that could be used to study disease, but lost in the bureaucratic bungling. There is a cell culture technique that use microcarriers (tiny plastic beads) that cells grow on in culture from which they secrete product which is processed. Silicon implants for whatever reason (shear coefficient) may create many flat surfaces for bacteria, fungi-viral growth in these implant incubators producing harmful toxins and intermediaries producing the illnesses: from genetic activation to infection; and could help in our understanding of diseases such as chronic fatigue syndrome, to MS to cancer, to... Again, this research has grown from an extension of the Viroid Thermodynamic Theory on the Origin of Life (V.T.T.), but because I have been blacklisted by the scientific community, perhaps the government of the United States itself, I have been unable to find anyone who will help me do this work of value to the public.

institutes were caught giving deliberate, false assurances and neither government is willing to enforce regulations and the law: No deterrent. What good are assurances? What good are public pronouncements of faith and conviction if you won't follow through?

The question is simple, Attorney General Ashcroft: Will you answer it? The whole point of this letter and asking the public to answer the same question, is to demonstrate the horrible ordeal an honest scientist must go through to uphold standards. If this is what one has to deal with, to develop new cancer answers, then what good are government's assurances? The answer appears to be none. Shall we see what the public has to say, or will you answer the question and enforce the law?

Thank you.

Very truly,

Edward A. Greenhalgh.

Email To Tommy Thompson
Secretary of Health and Human Services
Dated: October 23, 2001

Dear Secretary Thompson:

Regarding your testimony before the U.S. Congress, October 22, 2001 on Research regarding Biological Terrorism and government response. You are asked to review the attachment for the Website opening I am preparing, to ask the American people and international community for help. Please read the email sent to A.G. John Ashcroft; and then you should ask Mr. Ken Johnston, the Press Officer for Congress' Energy and Commerce Committee (received June 19, 2001) for the Addendum material (also ask DOJ and Deputy Chief Jo-Ann Farrington). It is directly relevant to the National Security of the United States. The U.S. government has blocked research of importance to the American people; and national security. Before establishing the website and asking the American people for their help directly, your response would be appreciated.

Thank you,
Edward A. Greenhalgh.