



CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL SCIENCE
Stephen Cavallino, M.D. - Founder & Chairman (Italy) • Amid Habib, M.D. • David Sim, M.D. • Robert Nemer, D.O.

THE PHYSICIAN'S CONCISE GUIDE TO:

- 2 -

Good News: It's Not Genetic

Copyright 2010



There is simply no one better in the 21st century at developing practical health-related solutions based on the world's leading medical and nutritional science. **"Science - Not opinion" is Brian's trademark.** When Brian is through explaining a topic it is "case closed!" When he says it, you "can take the information to the bank!"

Unlike most of his peers' recommendations, Brian's health and nutritional recommendations have stood the test of time. **Brian has never had to reverse or significantly alter any of his medical reports – reports that have tackled everything from the dangers of soy, to the wrongly popularized need for fiber in the diet, to his warning about the potential harm of supplementing with copious amounts of omega-3.** In 1995 he published the report "Fiber Fiction" and finally, eleven years later, others in research are acknowledging the silliness of recommending fiber in the diet of a human being. Brian's latest crusade is to warn of the dangers of excess omega-3 (in particular, fish oil) and how it will lead to increased cases of skin cancer. The list goes on and on...

Brian received an appointment as an Adjunct Professor at Texas Southern University in the Department of Pharmacy and Health Sciences (1998-1999). **The former president of the University said of his discoveries: "...His nutritional discoveries and practical applications through *Life-Systems Engineering* are unprecedented."** Brian earned his Bachelor of Science degree in Electrical Engineering from Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in 1979. Brian founded the field of *Life-Systems Engineering Science* in 1995. This field is defined as *The New Science of Maximizing Desired Results by Working Cooperatively with the Natural Processes of Living Systems*. To many, Brian is **THE MOST TRUSTED AUTHORITY ON HEALTH AND NUTRITION IN THE WORLD.**

Brian continues to be a featured guest on hundreds of radio and television shows both nationally and internationally. His sheer number of accomplishments during the last decade of the 20th century and into the 21st century are unprecedented and uniquely designate him as the #1 authority in the world of what really works and why. Forget listening to the popular press or most popular so-called health magazines. Their editors simply don't understand the complicated science that they write about - they merely "parrot" what everyone else says without independent scientific verification. Their recommendations often have no basis in reality of how the body works, based on its physiology.

Brian has dedicated his life to provide the truth - which is almost always opposite to what everyone says. Here's why Brian is the #1 man in America to listen to when it comes to your health.

Newsflash 2001: More Major Embarrassment and FAILURE— Traits *aren't* handed down in the manner described by Mendel. The so-called “ruined genetics” account for no more than 10% (the vast MINORITY) of disease: Everyone can now rest easy—it’s RARELY genetic...

The fledgling field of *epigenetics* (environmental factors) is now showing how two organisms with **identical genetic sequences** can have **different characteristics** because of **heritable *non-DNA factors*** (like methyl groups), which are common reactive chemical entities that *alter the behavior of genes*.

The search for simple “genetic mutations” as the cause of disease predictably fails again. As you shall discover, in contrast to getting better and allowing better explanations with time, the “genetic theory of disease” gets worse with time. Even the most brilliant researchers will never accomplish their goals because they all start in the wrong place. Mutations are *caused by* epigenetic adulteration (environmental causes altering the behavior of genes but not necessarily the structure). The *prime* cause of cancer is decreased cellular oxygen, which, of course, also alters the genetic material.

2011 Revelation

“So indeed, the genome contains far more inconvenient truths than was supposed a decade ago. *The very idea of what we inherit and what we pass on has changed.*”¹

The first 2011 article² clearly shows how the “promise” of looking at genetics fails and worries its scientists, as the whole field is looking worse and worse for actually finding solutions. It states:

1. Jon Cohen, “The Human Genome, a Decade Later,” *Technology Review*, January/February 2001, pages 40-44.

2. Stephen S. Hall, “The Genome's Dark Matter,” *Technology Review*, January/February 2011, pages 53-57.

“Evidence is growing that *your DNA sequence does not determine* your entire genetic fate. ...

“**Large-scale genomic studies over the past five years or so have mainly failed** to turn up common genes that play a major role in complex human maladies. ...

“More than **three dozen specific genetic variants** have been associated with type 2 diabetes, for example, but together, they have been found to **explain about 10 percent of the disease’s heritability** [90% *failure*] – the proportion of variation in any given trait that can be explained by genetics rather than by **environmental influences**.

“...That shouldn’t have affected the daughter mice at all, because females don’t inherit the Y chromosome. But the presence of that **uninherited DNA** in the previous generation exerted a profound effect on many of the more than 100 traits tested in the two sets of female offspring, whose own DNA was exactly the same.

“... In a separate but similarly **unsettling line of experiments**, Nadeau and his collaborators are finding that the **impact of any given gene depends on all the other genes surrounding it**. Nadeau is hardly the only scientist to identify these complex gene-gene interactions. ...

“Nadeau recalled giving a talk about all this at a conference several years ago and discovering afterward that a...**prominent Ivy League geneticist** in attendance, whom he declined to name, *simply couldn’t get the heretical ideas out of his head*. ‘He came up to me after the talk,’ Nadeau recalled, ‘and said, “**This can’t be true** in humans.” ’

“I ran into him at breakfast the next day and he said, ‘*This can’t be true in humans.*’ And then when the meeting was over, I ran into him at the airport, and he came up to me and said, ‘*This can’t be true in humans.*’

“Or as another leading genome scientist once told Nadeau at a meeting in Europe, ‘**If transgenerational³ [non-Mendelian] effects happen in humans, we’re screwed.**’

3. Transgenerational traits appear in DNA of parents or grandparents but not in current generation, yet can be influential and can be passed to subsequent generations. This runs counter to Mendel’s patterns of inheritance.

“That is to say, discovering that his findings apply to humans **would decouple a person’s DNA sequence from her or his traits, calling into question much of the work scientists have done to find the genetic sources of complex diseases** and develop drugs that target them.

“...The group analyzed **54 recently identified genetic locations** that statistical analysis suggested were the main contributors to height **and discovered that all of them together accounted for only 4 to 6 percent [94% failure] of the height variance** in thousands of subjects.

“The reason is not known, but the larger message is that *the effect of any variant seems to depend on its genetic surroundings.* ‘We see that effect all the time,’ Nadeau says. *‘All the time! Everywhere, in every trait we look at.’*

“It may sound like a dramatic break, but Nadeau says **these exceptions to Mendelian patterns** should come as no surprise. ‘Mendel picked the traits where he would get simple genetics,’ he explains. ‘What Mendel said is true. But it’s **not the whole truth.**’” (Emphasis added.)

The next article, titled “The human genome a decade later,”⁴ states:

“In June 13, 2010, the *New York Times* ran a front-page story about the hyping of genomics. Headlined “A Decade Later, **Gene Map Yields Few New Cures....**”

“Recent studies, however, have emphasized the extraordinary power of **DNA regions that do not hold the code for a protein itself but, rather, control** the on/off switches that direct gene ‘**expression,**’ or the extent to which that protein is actually produced.”

The fledgling field of *epigenetics* is showing how two organisms with **identical genetic sequences** can have **different characteristics** because of **heritable non-DNA factors like methyl groups**, which are common reactive chemical entities that **alter the behavior of genes.**

“So indeed, **the genome contains far more inconvenient truths** than was supposed a decade ago. *The very idea of what we inherit and what we pass on has changed.*”

4. Cohen, pages 40-44.

... Duke University geneticist David Goldstein argued in a critique published in the April 23, 2009, issue of the *New England Journal of Medicine*, that “*common variation is packing much less of a phenotypic punch than expected.*” A study on height, Goldstein noted, had found 20 variants that together explained only about 3 percent [97% *failure*] of the variation found in humans. These sorts of results have led some researchers to scratch their heads about “missing heritability” and the “dark matter” of the genome.”

‘This “omic” science has corrupted us,’ says Brenner, who won a Nobel Prize in 2002 for leading a project that four years earlier completed the first entire sequence of a multicelled organism, the worm *Caenorhabditis elegans*. **‘It has created the idea that if you just collect a lot of data, it will all work out** [like genome mapping].’”

‘I think we should be doing *genetics, not genomics,*’ says Brenner. ‘When you do genetics, you are focusing on function. When you do genomics, these are just letters and numbers. *Nobody bothers about the connections.*’

“ ‘Let’s start with the patient and work backward,’ says Altshuler. ‘Something that has profoundly diminished the biomedical impact of [genomic] work is the *unquestioned faith that everything can be learned in reductionist approaches* and model systems.’ ”

(Emphasis added.)

► *Life-Systems Engineering Science Commentary*

The great news is that heredity plays a much smaller role than we’ve been led to believe, and (shockingly to many) genes can be altered by the environment (both in positive and negative ways). That alteration can affect the **traits** of generations to come, although it might not appear in the **structure** of the genes themselves. *Conclusion: our behaviors, exposures, and remedial actions can affect our children.* This may seem like a hereditary factor, though not in the way Mendel describes—there can be external causes to current and future traits that we can take responsibility for (like PEO deficiency and PEO supplementation).

We can be comforted as well that *inheritance is a very minor cause of disease*. The statement, "The very idea of what we inherit and what we pass on has changed," tells it all. **In contrast to getting better and allowing better explanations with time, the "genetic theory of disease" gets worse with time; the opposite of any valid scientific theory.**

The scientists focusing on genetics were misled. The promise of the genome and the entire field of genetics are based on fallacies. The scientific truth was already given to us decades ago by the medical genius Otto Warburg, MD, PhD. *Life-Systems Engineering Science* makes significant discoveries that lead to practical solutions because this science does indeed connect all the dots, like the Nobel Prize-winner Sydney Brenner stresses.

Genetic manipulation has been the buzz for years now. We hear almost daily about the Human Genome Mapping project and how mapping the sequence of all the human genes is supposed to help us find “disease genes” and lead to the cause and cure for many diseases.

But let’s backtrack for a moment. Few doctors or researchers acknowledge that in the early 1900s there was an overall extremely low level of cancer in this country. Don’t believe anyone who says there was just as much cancer then as now, but it just wasn’t tracked. Physicians and the medical journals *did* track cancer rates at that time, and so did our government. One hundred years ago, only about 3% of us developed cancer! Yet cancer has skyrocketed to a current staggering 50% of the population today.

For cancer or other diseases to be caused genetically by the passing of genetic mutations from one generation to the next, one or more of our genes would have had to mutate into “cancer (or other disease) genes” and be passed along from generation to generation through reproduction. **But there simply hasn’t been enough time for a “genetic mutation” to be passed to 50% of the population.** A genetic mutation would take, at the least, many hundreds of years to become significant. So the likelihood of any type of genetic-based component, such as a mutation, reaching 50% of all Americans in 2003, when it was only 3% in 1900, is almost nonexistent.

Passing of Genes During Cell Division

When scientists speak of “cancer genes” and diseases being passed along via genetics, they also commonly refer to another means of passing genetic traits: the process *within one single organism or human body* in which genes are duplicated and passed to a new cell during cell division. Scientists speak of the possibility that a gene mutation in one cell may then be passed along when the cell divides, and spread a disease throughout the body.

But many scientists and researchers believe that, despite the massive hype that has been put forth to persuade the public that genetic answers to disease are just around the corner, trying to cure cancer or other serious diseases via genetics is still so far off in terms of what we understand about how genes “work,” that it is wasted effort.