

Chapter 2. The broadcasting (or not) of "pernicious" information

The Director of Inserm does not like typing errors

The unblinding of the experiment of July 9th, 1992 was experienced as a triumph by Benveniste and his team. The mean changes associated with each tube are presented in Table 2.1. The tubes which were associated with the highest biological activity were samples 1, 2, 3, 5 and 12 that corresponded to ovalbumin or LPS. Other tubes contained either "naive" water or "transmitted water", i.e. controls which were supposed to not modify coronary flow. Especially, in the previous chapter, we followed samples n°3 and n°4 step by step and we observed that n°3 was "active" whereas n°4 was "inactive". We know now that n°3 was "transmitted ovalbumine" and n°4 was "transmitted water".

J. Benveniste exulted. It was – if the experiment was confirmed – the crowning of long-term sustained efforts and J. Benveniste intended to repeat this type of demonstration so that other scientists would be convinced and could witness on the reality of the phenomenon. He immediately drafted a report of the experiment where, in conclusion, he did not hesitate to write in bold type:

"This experiment eloquently demonstrates the transmission of a biological activity by an electronic circuitry, asserting without any possible objection both the electromagnetic nature of the molecular information and the role of water as a magnetic tape, memory of this information."¹

Maybe it was jumping the gun. But the results were there and J. Benveniste explained: "There is a probability 1/4000 that this result is due to chance".

To allow an easy reading of the tables of results, even for the reader who is not accustomed to analyse this type of experiments, the following presentation is adopted for all tables: means of biological activity are classified *in an increasing order* and samples *supposed to be active according to the code* are indicated *in bold characters* in the last column. The "aim of the game" is thus to put a maximum of "bold" *in the box at the bottom of the last column.*

Tested samples	% of maximal changes of coronary flow (means)	Biological activities in increasing order	Unblinding
<i>Blind tests</i>			
n°6	3%	1	Water
n°4	3%	2	Water tr.
n°9	4%	3	Water
n°10	4%	4	Water tr.
n°7	5%	5	Water tr
n°8	8%	6	Water
n°11	14%	7	Water
n°1	35%	8	LPS tr.
n°12	40%	9	Ova tr.
n°2	41%	10	LPS tr.
n°5	73%	11	Ova tr.
n°3	84%	12	Ova tr.
<i>Open-label tests</i>			
Water	3%	-	-
Water tr.	3%	-	-
Ova tr.	36%	-	-
Ova 0.1 µmol/L	50%	-	-

Table 2.1 Result after unblinding of the experiment of July 9th, 1992. As indicated in the above box (last column of the table), the mean values of the biological activity were ranked in increasing order. After unblinding (right column), one notices that the highest activities correspond to the samples which were supposed to be the most active (LPS tr. and OVA tr. are all in the box at the bottom of the column “unblinding”). It was thus a “success” and it was indeed as if an “electromagnetic transmission” occurred.
tr.: Transmitted.

J. Benveniste sent this report to the participants of the experiment and to the Director of Inserm, P. Lazar, whom he always took care of informing on his work. If J. Benveniste expected to receive warm congratulations and enthusiastic encouragement of his administrative hierarchy, namely P. Lazar, it did not happen. The Director indeed answered him – with delay – by a brief, unkind and almost threatening letter:

“You sent me a circular letter on July 27th concerning an experimental result that could “hold my attention”.

I would like to point out that the attached sheet contains evident typing errors (the indications at the bottom of the table on “H2O”) and considering the sensibility, which you are well aware about your activities, there are surprising deficiencies of explanations (“There is a probability of 1/4000 that this result is

Chapter 2. The broadcasting (or not) of "pernicious" information

due to chance": *Which* result? Which difference between H2O and H2O tr?).

I would like to seriously draw your attention on the pernicious character of the broadcasting of such "information".

If you had to persist in this type of behavior, I would be obliged to take serious actions." ²

The "serious consequences" to which P. Lazar alluded were probably related to the next renewal of the laboratory of J. Benveniste that shall be discussed one year later by the scientific committees and the administration of Inserm. J. Benveniste then answered to P. Lazar:

"The report of experiment which I sent you is not a circular letter. It is a result of an experiment, intended for the dozen scientists who now oversee these experiments at U200. [...] The scientific events which take place now at Clamart are indeed of a sufficient importance so that I inform about them step by step, as I always did, a limited number of responsables. The purpose is to keep in touch, to look for a support and to allow criticisms and suggestions of the highest number of scientists, as yourself and the President of the Republic himself in a recent letter had constantly encouraged me. I thank you on one hand for your possible personal scientific participation and on the other hand for indicating me very exactly what is now forbidden to me and on what basis?

I send you a modified version of this report. There was effectively *one* omission, H2O tr. I rewrote the comment so that the difference between the active tubes and the controls appears more clearly, because it seems that you did not notice it". ³

In a letter which he sent on September 1st after the response of P. Lazar to a "colleague and friend" who was close to the management of Inserm, J. Benveniste expressed his anxiety:

"I send you these elements so that you can judge what motivates this storm (not diluted) in a glass of water. This answer worries me because: either P. Lazar loses his cool, and it is disturbing in itself; either he gives in to outside pressure, which that become very strong after the disclosure of our transmission experiments, and anything and everything, including the most absolute arbitrary power, can arise.

In both cases, the researchers of U.200, who – is it necessary to remind? – and, even if they make a mistake this time, committed no crime, no fault and scientific error, with continuous "classic"

production in journals of the best level, will need your help and your advices.”

“The consequences of these new results will be incalculable.”

Despite the veiled threats of P. Lazar related to the “pernicious character of the broadcasting of such "information" ”, J. Benveniste sent a circular letter to many scientists and colleagues to inform them about these results and to invite them to participate in these experiments:

“In the past few weeks, we obtained a scientific result, which was certainly predictable, but which is not less surprising. To put it simply, we transfer an activity [...] between two sealed glass vials through a radioelectric device. [...] The transmitted activities disappear with heating which leaves the original molecules intact. We just “unblinded” an experiment, in collaboration with a group of scientists not belonging to the laboratory: 12 correct results out of 12, there is a probability 1/4000 that this is obtained by chance [...]”⁴

J. Benveniste can then expose his ideas on the conceptual framework of these results:

“Now one will have simply to accept that a biological molecule, at least in its function of specific signal, is in fact the only support, inert in itself, of fluctuating charges that generate a specific radioelectric activity which is the true vector of the molecular information. The natural role of water around molecules is the role of a liquid magnetic tape capable of storing temporarily, and maybe amplifying, the information between two molecules at a distance of a few angstrom. Only molecules presenting co-resonant fields [...] can recognize themselves, even remotely, and then can communicate by exchanging energy. Yet, we know almost nothing at present about mechanisms of recognition and exchange of molecular information [...]. Nevertheless, the consequences of these new results will be incalculable ...”

Finally, he linked these results with the “memory of water”:

"[These results] confirm what was called – we know it now with good reason – “the memory of water”. By diluting/shaking we have, it seems, artificially separated the molecules of their natural environment, water, which preserves information, by mechanisms

Chapter 2. The broadcasting (or not) of “pernicious” information

still to explore but for which theories are published, and transmits it from molecule to molecule.”

Finally, he invited the recipients of the letter to join the group without wasting any time because, he said “U200 being guilty (we confessed it) of innovation outside the allowed limits will soon be closed”.

New experiments were already scheduled. Did they confirm this first success?

Notes of end of chapter

¹ Letter of July 27th, 1992 to the participants of the experiment of July 9th, 1992.

² Letter of P. Lazar to J. Benveniste of August 18th, 1992.

³ Letter of J. Benveniste to P. Lazar of August 25th, 1992.

⁴ Circular letter of J. Benveniste dated July 1992.