Dear George,

After many hours of telephone conversations with you and the other parties you introduced, and several more hours thinking, I believe I have come at least to understand your grand plan. As I see it now, I think it has major difficulties, which I have set out on the attached pages.

I have divided your approach into three parts:
  1) The patent
  2) DNA bonds
  3) The "Matrix", settling it up.

It seems to me that your ambition for (3), led you to (2), to be financed by (1) and its corollaries.

I understand 1), pursuing the patent, but (2) and (3) are complicated and muddy waters unless one has entrepreneurial experience or temperament.

It could be that you will lose 1) by spreading it to (2) and (3), at least at this stage.

I have written frankly. I have spent many hours freely on the matter, and will do more looking over the matter, and its consequences, but if I am to be involved further, I think my relationship to you and your parties should at some point be put on a professional basis and clarified. Who am I dealing with? You, as an individual, or I.C.T. or the International Licensing Network? I cannot use my reputation and experience in what looks to me like a fool's errand, in promoting or advocating (2) or (3).

I thought it best to set out my misgivings on paper before I get any deeper into your enterprise, without introducting some realism.

Thank you for your good wishes for the New Year. May I recapitulate, and hope you will be successful in health, happiness and family.

Aaron
Dear George,

The problem as I see it, is that you are, or appear to be, conflating three objectives, in a grand scheme, they are:

1) To have your patent (to be issued shortly) recognised by the biotech and pharma world so that they will take out licenses and pay for them. This could be a stand-alone objective.

2) To set up a new financial vehicle, DNA bonds, which would be financed by investors (and income from(1)), securitised by patent income from(1), and used to invest in future biotechnology ventures, including (or even primarily?) the “matrix” of (3).

3) To feed an existing company or organisation to set up or “build the matrix” (that word, your party use), presumably to find “binding pairs” of antibodies and random peptides. This is to be used in ways not specified, though the example you gave is to compete out such an array of pairs with a virus or receptor strain. To attack short amino acid sequences present in the competitor.

Remarks:

1) The patent is quite independent of the others: it could make you rich if pursued on its own.

I have not yet seen the patent which Shain told you he would send, but he says he expects it to dominate all existing combinatorial patents involving peptide and oligonucleotide (except possibly Kaufmann’s).

Its strength would seem to be based on the “composition of matter” principle, in that any use of
Whatever the details, the strategy would, I think, be opposed by the many companies already engaged for many years in various forms of co-operation, as indeed are the big pharma. This can be done by relying on re-examination in the Patent Office or challenging in court, as have experience of this in the DePuy vs Rock Larr case, which Lynn Rosenthal mentions to you, and more recently in the Rock vs Omega, not yet settled after 10 years?

Is your backer have money to prosecute the patent over a long haul? Or are you relying on the hope that some income will flow from some companies taking out licences (which of course depend on licensing policy, as you have explained, high or low royalty, or vice versa).

2) DNA GCodes. This idea is to use the prospect of money coming from 1) to get others to invest. Because of the security that offers, in what is essentially a venture capital enterprise in biotechnology. Who is to run this? Who is to decide what to invest? No names are mentioned, other than Goldschmidt or (I) or you. Goldschmidt and DiCicco are certainly experts. Then they set up other companies in this field or others, if they have, have they succeeded?

Your name is mentioned as possibly taking part. What is your experience in decision-making in commercial enterprises? My experience of venture capitalists is that they are not so interested in the inventor, however original, but look to potential
3) "Setting up the matrix." This seems to me to be your ultimate interest as an inventor–scientist, and work in which you could be personally involved. But times have moved on since 1985. There are many companies out there, already working successfully, on what you would call "particular aspects" of your matrix猜想.

If you would not, in the example you gave me which I cited above, nowaday use the matrix to find sequence of parts of genes. Genomic sequencing is now so rapid, that it is an easy matter to determine the sequence of any desired regions, organelle, receptor, or indeed a whole organism. (Each month or week seems to see another prokaryote sequenced.) So the genomic sequence is where one would start from. The next stage is proteomics or functional genomics, in the former case testing relevant & (or candidate) peptides, not random ones, to assay antibodies, to find out where localized, interacting partners, e.g. receptors...

So I do not see "setting up the matrix" as a pure step, even if the technology were available to handle the whole "universe" all at once. The fact is that there are "sub-universes", in which people work..."