

Re: genes and language (Homer, Richard Dawkins)

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-02/1271.html>

From: Franz Gnaedinger (*frgn_at_bluemail.ch*)

Date: 02/16/05

Date: 16 Feb 2005 10:38:35 -0800

Jacques Guy: so you got those photocopies. I don't try to convince people, but I give some people a chance to see a relevant work they might otherwise miss, in this case the wonderful translation of the Phaistos Disk given by Derk Ohlenroth of Tuebingen university. It's up to you what you make of it.

Philip Deitiker: must I remember you again of your silly (if not plain stupid) explanation of how to measure out the base of the Great Pyramid to the amazing accuracy according to Rainer Stadelmann? and your piss bucket reply here in this thread, main title: Did the Trojan war ... (still a coherent thread in Google beta) ? Kooks thrive not only outside academe, there are plenty of kooky ideas and opinions inside academe, especially when it comes to early civilizations outside Europe.

Edus in general: nobody could answer my question from past August: what is language? I provided my answer in the middle of October, as announced. Nobody could point out a fault in my definition. Either you discuss with me, or you keep away from me. None of you has won a debate with me, so far, which is why you never try. It's so much easier to drop a "kook" from above. Know that there are plenty of kooks in academe too, not only outside academe (as I said above). Back in 1974 I interpreted Leonardo da Vinci's Mona Lisa as an Allegory of Seeing and explained her smile with the fovea and retina. Friends of mine could easily see what I meant and were very pleased. Academe missed all I saw: Your work is very interesting; however, there would nobody be interested in your work, since, according to the whole redaction, each and everything had been said about the Mona Lisa ... No joke. That was a reaction I got for my work. In October 2000 I published a brief English version of my interpretation in sci.archaeology, and then, in 2001, Dr. Margaret Livingstone, a neurobiologist of Harvard, published the very same explanation. So my

explanation from 1974 had been confirmed 27 years later.
I am sure that my definition of language – language is basically the means of getting help and understanding from those we depend upon in order to satisfy our needs and fulfill our wishes; and every means that serves this purpose may be called language – will stay in the textbooks, even schoolbooks. And so will my interpretations of beautiful Helen of the white arms, xanthos Menelaos, lovely Hermione who resembled golden Aphrodite, a slave woman and mistress of Menelaos, and their son late come strong Megapenthes, as tin, copper, bronze, aurichalcit and brass respectively, stay in every book on ancient Greece and Homer thirty years from now.

Scientific comments are welcome, but please keep away from this thread when you are just dropping a prioris, ex cathedras, eo ipsos and anyways.

–

Franz Gnaedinger www.seshat.ch

- > *I have absolutely enough, absolutely enough!*
- > *The "pathological liar" and "compulsive slanderer"*
- > *is Marie Jean Faucounau alias grapheus alias fr.soc.*
- > *histoire.antique alias circle alias Alan_Crozier*
- > *(not identical with Alan Crozier). I do not allow*
- > *to be placed on the same level with him. He lost his*
- > *case, the intimidating strategy used by his lawyer*
- > *did not work, I have not and in no way been convicted,*
- > *a Weisung simply says that the lawyer can go to court,*
- > *either till the end of February, or perhaps till the*
- > *end of March, if he believes he has a case, but he*
- > *does not do that, I am certain. Marie Jean Faucounau*
- > *lost his case and has now to pay a lot of money to*
- > *his expensive lawyer. This upsets him, and he shows*
- > *who he really is. That's is my very very last warning.*
- > *I wish everybody to keep away from this thread, I use*
- > *it for working, for developing my framework of a general*
- > *theory of language (from genes to humans to aliens,*
- > *if you need a juicy title), and not for being stalked*
- > *and molested and harassed and slandered. My very last*
- > *warning. Franz Gnaedinger www.seshat.ch*
- >
- >
- >> *Genetic engineering and communication in the web of life*
- >> *– before I can come to this topic of my today's message*
- >> *I have to say another word about the insane replies*
- >> *full of lies I am getting these days.*
- >>
- >> *For the record: I do not live on welfare, and never*
- >> *lived on welfare; I do not life from charity, and*

sci.archaeology: Re: genes and language (Homer, Richard Dawkins)

> > *never lived from charity. I live modestly, and lived
> > very modestly. I can live in such a way since, I find
> > ample satisfaction in the various scientific areas I
> > am working in. In my spare time I am volunteering for
> > a relief organisation, and I spent a considerable sum
> > of money on a client of mine. I also supported other
> > people, and enabled a young woman who had been tricked
> > out of her studies to go on; anonymously, with quite
> > a lot of money. While living most modestly myself.*

> >
> > *Marie Jean Faucounau alias grapheus lost his case.
> > There was no lawsuit. He could not drag me in court.
> > I was neither convicted of anything, nor had I to pay
> > a single cent. All Marie Jean Faucounau grapheus got
> > (I may infer) was a big fat bill from his expensive
> > lawyer, and now, he must feel, that money buys him
> > a right to spread big fat lies about me.*

> >

> > -----

> >

> > *Genes are basic to life, and, as I believe, alive
> > themselves, whether occurring in organisms, cells,
> > bacteria, or even viruses. Now let me ponder some
> > consequences of such a view.*

> >

> > *If a gene could be synthesized in a laboratory, and
> > if it is alive, one would have created artificial life.
> > Is that so? I would say no. A basic insight of biology
> > claims that life comes from life. This basic principle
> > would also hold if genes were synthesized in a lab,
> > either by people, or by machines designed by people,
> > or by machines designed by machines designed by human
> > beings.*

> >

> > *Genetic engineering would then just be an extension
> > of the biological principle that life comes from life,
> > and genes are the same whether synthesized in a living
> > organism or in a laboratory, even by clever machines
> > designed by humans. Eric J. Chaisson, in his book
> > Cosmic Evolution, believes that civilization is heading
> > for genetic engineering (following an intrinsic trend
> > of all evolution toward an ever denser sustainable
> > energy flux).*

> >

> > *So we must not care about warning voices concerning
> > genetic engineering? I don't say that, not at all.
> > We have enough reasons to proceed carefully.*

> >

> > *Genes are obliged to cooperate, and so they may well
> > have sort of a language, since language occurs where
> > living beings or entities are depending on each other.*

sci.archaeology: Re: genes and language (Homer, Richard Dawkins)

> > *RNA or DNA might even be a materialized language among
> > genes (according to an article in Science, if memory
> > serves). Now consider a new gene, whether synthesized
> > in a virus or in a lab, exposed in living organisms:
> > here, they will undergo a process of communication
> > that will be crucial for the new gene: will it be
> > accepted or rejected? and if accepted, where shall
> > it be incorporated? Such an evaluation process by
> > means of communication among genes may take a long
> > time and provide answers that perhaps come from
> > completely unexpected places. Life is a global web,
> > and if we act against it, we risk getting an answer
> > we may not like at all.*

> >
> > *So genetic engineering, I find, should go along with
> > a global communication on all levels. We can't give all
> > answers ourselves and beforehand; we should listen to
> > the answers given to us by the web of life.*

> > -
> > *Regards Franz Gnaedinger www.seshat.ch*

> >
> >
> >
> >
> > > *Are viruses alive or not? I shall ponder that question
> > > today, but first I have to say another word on my
> > > perpetual molestor, who is defaming me since years.*

> > >
> > > *For the record: there was a mistake in my previous message,
> > > the date was November 25, not September 24. Otherwise I
> > > stand by every word I wrote. Marie Jean Faucounau alias
> > > grapheus alias fr.soc.histoire.antique alias circle alias
> > > Alan_Crozer (abusing the name of a respectable poster)
> > > is heavily projecting. His unvoluntary auto-diagnosis
> > > "pananoiac delirium" (sic) is obviously sorrect. When we
> > > writes about me, he reveals himself. He is the compulsive
> > > slanderer he accuses me of being.*

> > >
> > > -----
> > >

> > > *Are viruses alive or not? An article in a recent issue of
> > > the Scientific American was quite fascinating. Viruses are
> > > parasites depending on host organisms wherein they multiply.
> > > Most viruses are harmless. A virus is a bag containing
> > > DNA sequences or genes that undergo high mutation rates.
> > > Viruses "invent" new genes that are sometimes incorporated
> > > into the genome of a host organism. Thus, viruses might be
> > > playing a crucial role in evolution. In any case, viruses
> > > belong to the web of life.*

> > >
> > > *Now let me compare a scientific group in the Usenet with*

sci.archaeology: Re: genes and language (Homer, Richard Dawkins)

>>> *a living organism, and a kook with a virus.*
>>>
>>> *Viruses flood a host organism, if they can, and multiply*
>>> *their genes, whereas kooks flood a scientific forum, if*
>>> *they can, always repeating their message. Most viruses*
>>> *are harmless, and so are most kooks; but some are really*
>>> *harmful and mean. Viruses might be survivors of a former*
>>> *RNA stage of life, while we often encounter an atavistic*
>>> *reasoning in kooks. The genes in viruses quickly mutate,*
>>> *while kooks always change their infiltration strategy.*
>>>
>>> *On the positive side, viruses are inventing new genes*
>>> *that are sometimes incorporated into the genomes of a host*
>>> *and may thus play a crucial role in evolution. Also kooks*
>>> *have sometimes a good idea, or rather a feeling for what*
>>> *is missing in the views of academe, for example in the*
>>> *case of the Great Pyramid at Giza: kooks have always felt*
>>> *the presence of geometry in that majestic building, and*
>>> *kept alive their belief, until someone might reveal the*
>>> *geometrical methods used by the pyramid builders ...*
>>> *I got that virus myself, and found some of those methods,*
>>> *including a systematic way of calculating the circle on*
>>> *the basis of the Sacred Triangle 3–4–5 (c.f. my website).*
>>>
>>> *Viruses belong to the web of life, and kooks belong to the*
>>> *Web. – That was a cheap one, but still. And yes, the genes*
>>> *contained in viruses, I believe, belong to life, are alive.*
>>>
>>> *Next time: philosophical and ethical consequences of such*
>>> *a view, and how the problem involved can possibly be solved*
>>> *within my framework of a general theory of language; might*
>>> *be relevant for genetic engineering.*
>>> –
>>> *Regards Franz Gnaedinger www.seshat.ch*