

Modify this!: How genetics can be fiddled with, but life cannot.

A friend pointed out to me the interesting point that genetic engineers always have to start with living tissue in their process of modification, they can never start from scratch. So the nature of the geneticist, be they an actual engineer, researcher or counsellor or whatever, is someone who believes in numerous principles which are clearly based in a Newtonian conception of biology, something that people such as Rupert Sheldrake are now clearly putting to bed, with the clarity of a quantum shift in science, please see: <http://www.sheldrake.org/homepage.html>

However the premise is that fiddling with the genetics is something that humans can and should do, after all they fiddle with everything else so why not this too, in the mind of the biologist it's just engineering on the small scale. This shows you how materialistic the nature of genetics is, and also engineering interestingly! Of all of the expressions of science genetics has to be at the forefront of arrogance and total misunderstanding of the nature of nature. The idea that a process of millions of years of change can be fiddled about with in a few hours, days, weeks, months or years, in order to produce a new strain simply beggars belief in its misunderstanding.

Parasites, like malaria, are so well adapted that they are able to adjust far more efficiently than can cells in the human body to any change in their environment, any attempts to kill them off are impossible due to the fact that these organisms are older in lineage than the human by thousands of years, yet still the struggle continues to find a cure where none actually exists. Malaria only became a problem when lands were farmed and monoculturalism tried to take off which created environmental shifts and changes instigating an imbalance and thereby huge infection. Malaria is a human-based illness, as is almost every other illness that has pandemic effect (see "[Sex at Dawn: The prehistoric Origins of modern sexuality](#)"). Genetics suggests the possibility of modifying humans who will be immune to these problems but of course this induces numerous other possibilities that "Outbreak"-type thriller film scenarios depict in great detail. What is actually far more likely to occur is that the intended result of these attempted modifications will fail completely. Historically humans create things which fail to achieve their intended purpose, much like modern medicine drugs inducing genie-out-of-the-bottle consequences due to their side-effects. Rather than forming a pathogen that is so ravenous it kills the planet, viruses and natural pathogens are far better at killing off large numbers of people such as occurred with the bubonic plague in 1340-1400. This is all natural, humans are much more likely to create a crop that makes people sick so they stop eating it, or that suddenly creates a natural reaction like a storm of insects they forgot to make the "new-wheat" immune to or some imbalance that nature effects to immediately put an end to the fiddling.

The idea that genetics has a real future is the mindset of those optimistic Newtonians who are still unaware the rug is about to be pulled from under them, aka Richard Dawkins, Brian Cox et al. Even though the genetic engineer can fiddle with some things it's what they can't do this is actually more interesting and more telling. Why can't humans bring life to material, why doesn't Frankenstein's monster actually exist, doesn't it need just a bolt of the electricity in the right place to start things off, just like your car engine on a cold winter's day, a quick boost and it's away. But this simply doesn't work, no-one has managed to get dead tissue to come back to life

again, you can't re-form something which has no expansive energy in it, so what is this "life", what starts this off, what's the ignition switch and why can't we control it?

In genetics and in biology this is the Holy Grail which links up with the God Particle of modern physics and other phenomena that are unknown and unknowable because they simply can't be explained in materialistic type models. In the end this is what makes it possible for numerous scientists to be "religious" as well as "scientific" and be happy with this, because they know there is "something else" which is unexplainable and this then is put down to God rather than science, God becomes a miscellaneous box, much like quantum physics, but perhaps the dualistic concept of God and the dualistic concept of science go together, or resonate at the same frequency, and in fact it's all within something much more simple.

The energetic field of life has no beginning and end, neither does it exist in isolated units or controllable by "individuals", because the energetic field does not see separate units/"individuals" but simply a sea of energy. For the geneticist who sees things in separate units defined by borders, there is a total limitation in understanding and also a huge complexity of what they are seeing, there is no perspective. For that which is the sea there is no requirement to fiddle, whereas for that which believes it is separate there is an extreme focus on fiddling in order to find the way back to the sea, which already is but is not seen. The process is all about "me". Most scientists do not question their fundamental premise for doing what they are doing. They might touch the surface and say it's a job, or it's "what I'm really interested in", or because it's great to fiddle with this stuff or whatever, but it's all a game-like investigation to keep the mind occupied or sidelined into some autism. However if they dared to investigate beyond this spiritual surface they would reach a deeper reason which is much more local, more real and far more fearsome, which in fact is usually the real reason they want to "fix" something, in order to stop the angst of "self". They want to escape the nagging feeling that the death of "me" is looming and so they engage in a type of armoung to try and "save" "me" from this situation, when what they're really seeking is simply a way back "home".

Science and politics are far more personal than we realize, they are all about the fears of believed-in "individuals" and this plays out in their work and expressional life. It's all about the suffering of the "me" as are all human ideals beyond those of the most simple natural requirements. The process of genetics is a frantic seeking for something better, a far cry from the natural intelligence of permaculture and transitional expressions in agriculture which are to do with allowing nature to take over. Genetics is all about taking the reins, leading nature away from the believed "wrong" path it's taken and back to the very straight and radically narrow path of "me".

The reason that geneticists can't solve the life-instigation issue is simply because they have no understanding of life, only of the nature of their concept of "matter" or materials. Energy can't be "got-at" it simply *is*, neither can it can't be manipulated because it is both the manipulator and the manipulated together, one can't in a sense modify oneself and this is exactly what is going on in a genetic engineering lab. The geneticists are fiddling with themselves, so to speak! However the fundamental point is that life transforms and this transformation cannot be altered after a certain point and anyway why would someone want to? Why does so-called altruism make us

strive to stop all forms of pain when we have no true understanding of dis-ease or suffering, or that it is in fact suffering which is actually the issue, not the pain. Pain has always existed, but suffering is the add-on. Genetics and modern medicine and the general Newtonian-based scientific community are all on the conveyer belt of dealing with pain but it is suffering that always stands in their way and is always what they are chasing, though they don't realise it. Life is life, it expands and it lets go, but the thing that wishes to control this is the aspect that believes it is not part of this process and that it can take control and this is the dis-ease itself, the combined expression of pure ignorance and pure arrogance which are perfectly expressed in modern genetics.

The Frankensteinian monster, which is essentially the expression of a primitive/animal-human, the vulnerable and forlorn expression that is deemed to have no place within "civil" society, is truly the nature of nature. The scientist believes that it is he who has brought the monster to life, but in fact the scientist is himself the monster and Frankenstein is the true face of the human being. Just as Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde express the two faces, the monster, which is the primitive expression, is held back in its nature and then forces itself to the surface and explodes in a trail of blood. The holding down of nature is to deform and to warp it. The scientist warps himself, controls himself, and affects himself in a way that fiddles with what he is intrinsically part of, thereby forming himself into the very monster he despises. When the scientist lets go, Frankenstein becomes the natural human he always was, when Dr. Jekyll lets go then Mr. Hyde no longer needs to hide and so calms to the natural human state again. These images are expressions of human intervention, but what the scientist does he does to him/herself, it is simply a cycle of seeking that ends with a realization that "I" can never be in control, it is like the drop of water at the tip of the wave trying to manipulate the current of the sea....this is also akin to the story of King Canute:-

KING CANUTE A poem, by Paul Perro

There once was an old king called King Canute,
And he was a very bossy old brute.
"Bring me my crown, and hurry!" he would say,
He told everyone what to do all day.
He said to the queen "I like being the king
And being in charge of everything."

The queen looked at King Canute and she laughed.
She said "Not everything, don't be daft.
You couldn't command the wind not to blow,
You couldn't command a tree not to grow.
You're not in charge of the birds or the bees,
The sun or the moon, the skies or the seas.

"Oh yes I am," said the King, getting cross
"I am, I'll prove it, I'll show you who's boss!"
He called the servants together and then
He bellowed out an order to his men:
"Pick up my throne and take it to the beach,

There is a lesson that I want to teach.”

So they carried his throne down to the ocean
Followed by crowds, there was quite a commotion.
Canute sat on the throne facing the sea
And spoke to it with great authority.
“I am your king and I give this command -
Stay where you are, do not come on this sand”

But the sea didn’t listen to the king
No-one can stop the tide from coming in.
As the waves kept advancing up the shore
The red-faced king tried to halt them once more.
“I am the King, you must do as I say,
I command you to go back, right away.”

But the waves still came, right up to his feet.
Canute sighed sadly, admitting defeat.
He faced the queen and said “You won the bet
And I have got my royal slippers wet.
I did my best, but no, I came up short.
I guess I’m not as powerful as I thought.”

(Quoted from: <http://www.history-for-kids.com/king-canute.html>)

Also when science is forced to let go, nature returns:
<http://uk.news.yahoo.com/wildlife-thriving-after-chernobyl's-nuclear-disaster---study.html>

David Nassim
11/9/12