Theoretical Footnotes and Practical Solutions

1. What Good can President Bush Do (about biotechnology)?
2. Human Evolution: Elaine Morgan's Aquatic Apeman.
3. Stem Cell (Alternate) Research Theory.

Blacklisting has been repeatedly cited as preventing the research, and a method to get around it was simply to "give away" the theories for others to copy. Hence, the following:

1. What good can President Bush do (about biotechnology)?

   President Bush has repeatedly said he wants to reduce energy dependence and is asking for technology to develop alternate fuel sources etc. Is he being truthful or just talking? Exotic alternatives such as fuel cell technology have received some government money to this end, but there is an even simpler alternative such as methane/natural gas. I have been critical of bad biotechnology and bad scientists, many who hold their hands out promising pie in the sky wonder drugs "someday', but here is an opportunity to immediately develop something good from biotechnology by good scientists and good companies. Please note, people like John Huntsman appear on television claiming they want practical answers (to cancer), but when offered practical solutions they do not act. My research is proven practical: I am alive. V.T.T. considers human sewage a bacteria source, which contributes to cancers in humans and other diseases. Why not use biotechnology to eliminate the problem by:

   1. Conversion to methane; for heating and electrical generation. The results would be more available energy, less air pollution, and cleaner water. Which in turn will reduce human diseases such as cancer, asthma etc. The sheer savings to the medical system will be immense and that alone would pay for the cost of any research development.
   2. Urine separated could be enhanced with nitrogen to urea to be used for crops requiring high nitrogen like corn producing ethanol for fuel.
   3. (1.) and (2.) would also lead to cleaner water by removing other contaminants from the water supply; many recyclable.

Bottom line: with all the major cities producing huge amounts of sewage, creating disease etc., the quicker this is converted to clean energy (natural gas) the better Methane production is by bacteria. The major breweries have a vast knowledge of fermentation: it would be in everyone's best interest to develop this energy producing technology, even to the extent of federal monies to "start-up" the research process. And being practical, do not let it operate as inefficiently as cancer research. Do not allow vague answers or vague deadlines. Set ("moon landing") deadlines. The revenues for companies to develop such biotechnology will be rewarding. The energy produced will be more than equivalent to both Iraq's and the Alaskan Wilderness reserves combined. If

biotechnology is to have a good side, this is the one, and it could be developed very quickly. President Bush just has to be truthful and sincere.

2. Elaine Morgan's Aquatic Apeman

Elaine Morgan's hypothesis may serve as a model to explain many forms of evolution. Ms. Morgan has proposed an aquatic ancestor to man, and V.T.T. may not agree on a full aquatic Apeman, but it believes she has made an important contribution helping to understand all evolutionary processes. Just as V.T.T. acknowledges that Fraenkel-Conrat said viruses were the origin of life and built from his theory; V.T.T. would build from Ms. Morgan's original thinking. Just like Fraenkel-Conrat, Ms. Morgan has been the recipient of hostility from the scientific community. To her original idea, V.T.T. would like to insert the "natural genetic engineers" of viruses, disease and environmental change/feedback. V.T.T. sees pressures on the environment (like massive flooding-ice caps melting) affecting all animal species during this transitional period, and whether or not an actual hominid resulted is not a prime concern: the transitional stages and effects are. The transitional ape human ancestor. In particular what V.T.T. emphasizes are common, underlying, environmental, driving forces (changes in food, statistically large populations of dead/dieing bodies generating bacterial build up causing disease driving retro viral vectors) which "found" specific sites (Dr. Ed Eastman's sectional genome is important because this effect will cause more changes more quickly than possible with the dogma of one gene-one protein) affecting man's earlier ancestor, particularly the brain (i.e., Eastman; aquatic affects of segments acts on segment areas). Elaine Morgan has noted body adaptations to fit into an aquatic world; whether an ancient hominid went all the way or not, there still would be transitional species/changes. I do not believe a fully aquatic Apeman would be a successful competitor against whales and dolphins. However, a transitional hominid would be more competitive than non-evolved arboreal chimps, gorillas etc. (and perhaps their "land locked" evolving development phases. This is where many ancestral branches of competing apes disappeared, and why.)

What V.T.T. wishes to emphasize with the concept of underlying driving forces and their effects is the major result was the development of man's brain (in specific areas). What is brainpower needed for? Raptors were considered to have been very "intelligent" hunters. So are sharks. And wolves. What is different with man, because what I am stressing is that a relatively small brain is all that is needed to be an "intelligent" efficient hunter? And cattle and sheep have relatively small brains in order to graze and outwit predators. Please note that the "descendants" of sheep and cattle, dolphins and whales have enlarged brains which some have proposed was a result essentially for recognizing and organizing their spatial location in a 3-dimensional water environment. The argument has always been made that apes have a 3-D arboreal world too, but what V.T.T. suggests is this (facility) was augmented by the common underlying driving forces (i.e., diseases/retroviruses) effect. This effect would split the branches of the hominid line, and explains why other "land based" lines (not effected by the retroviruses) became dead ends; or unable to compete against the "aquatic" influenced line.

"Most simply", early land carnivores evolved into the plant eating ungulates (cattle and sheep). Whales and dolphins (plankton and meat eaters) are the aquatic descendants of the ungulates. Why did cattle and sheep evolve thus and in response to what pressures? Environmental changes to habitat and food sources (energy) occurred which were directed by disease (cancer/viruses and bacteria) causing the ungulates to adapt to an

expanding water environment. Note that cattle etc exist today (as do chimps etc.) but environmental change made a niche available and "evolution experimented" with various genome constructs that could thrive there. Where niches remained unchanged, they remained filled with previously successful genome constructs (i.e., note crocodiles have remained essentially the same since before dinosaurs). Yet others followed the change to the new niche, forced by the large scale environmental changes (especially the presence of disease agents) so with one niche closing and another opening in order for life to keep (the chemical reaction) replicating, life (DNA and proteins) had to follow the available, useable energy, to a new environment or cease to replicate (or lose out to another genome). Evolution is that simple.

Natural Selection and competition occur when two genome types measure each others' suitability as to which is the most "efficient" (use of a genome platform) to fill a niche. Sex is to allow the expression ("exaggeration") of traits so modifying the phenotype (physical form) for "best fit" to the environment. "Evolution has several layers."

The environmental pressures (i.e., physical land to water) with resultant diseases (wastes, thousands of dead carcasses) acted upon all the animals: especially these with "disease receptors". The concept of diseases identifying specific animals and gene sites represents a "specificity" and needs more study, and the concept of viral (retro)-type environmental signal interactions to direct evolution. Early hominids would be affected. So, V.T.T. suggests that Elaine Morgan's changes to create an aquatic ape did occur as a result of disease agent actions: retro-viral insertions while bacterial required proteins in a "CHAOS-type" synchronization. Individuals are not important as individuals, but organisms as part of an interrelated environment ("plasma") are.

Not all organisms would change since they fill a niche successfully which is why chimps etc still exist. Others would be modified but not wholly transformed, while others would be completely changed (ungulates to whales). I do not believe a fully evolved aquatic Apeman would be very competitive vs. a dolphin: man's advantage of an omnivore would not be conserved to compete as a sole fish eater while the necessary genome platform transformations would be too great an energy expenditure compared to the changes necessary for the ungulate conversion.

A new factor for evolutionary change: the efficiency of transforming genomes. If there are two (or more species) competing for the same niche, the species requiring less genome changes will succeed.

All genomes can adapt if necessary though and there are no competing genomes.

The hominid advantage is of being an omnivore, and would adapt more efficiently for an omnivore environment, meaning it would "stop competing with a more efficient genome construct, and find a better niche, but retain any traits that may be advantageous gained to the genome through viral interaction. Viral insertion affects more than one trait one gene, one protein is wrong, gene loci must be viewed more in line with Dr. Ed Eastman's body sectional concept.

A theoretical argument is to classify on Genomic Construct Principles which would relate genomes to building principles found in mathematical, harmonic and thermodynamic theory. A hominid construct would be an energetic waste compared to an ungulate in an aquatic environment/competition. Evolution may simply be the modification of basic genome constructs based upon mathematical principles and energy distribution (thermodynamics). Evolution is the evolving utilization of very basic genome constructs, which modify to fill niches in response to energy supplies. Genomes grow until a new distinct platform develops separate from the previous in direct response to the food/plant genome constructs available (stored energy). Genome Constructs are evolved forms for storing energy in response to the change in available energy forms. A new classification system is being suggested: a new way of viewing and comparing all life-fish, amphibians, reptiles, mammals, and birds/dinosaurs. The same would be true for plants.

Nonetheless, with the aquatic hominid argument, changes did occur, and, although the Apeman was NOT the best form for the aquatic energy pursuit, changes of value did result that mode the hominid more competitive than his non-affected cousins. One especially important change was the enlargement of the same areas of the brain as had occurred with the aquatic mammals. With our direct ancestral hominid, as opposed to the other hominid branches, which were evolving to, fill a land niches only (spin off of chimps etc.) the small gene loci affected was enough to separate the "branches". Dr. Eastman's theory is important because many traits can be effected by "slight changes (man and chimps are approximately separated by 2-3% gene differences). The others became evolutionary dead ends because the advantages of the aquatic modified hominid was able to out compete them (Darwinian) for the land niche and continued to evolve to modern man (latent expression, why the Y chromosome is shrinking but can't be included in an oversimplified discussion). By remaining on land the partially transformed hominid did not need to use this extra (new) brain capacity for 3-D aquatic location but could be used to coordinate with present brain programming for other tasks including problem solving. This 3-D brain would give man "spacial or abstract" thought: art mathematics and philosophy.

Why the Aquatic Hominid was an Improved Omnivore and Out Competed Land based Rivals. Farming is Modified Hunting.

An omnivore like a bear is essentially a hunter; i.e., meat, bugs, honey and plants. So are chimps and early hominids. Philosophy sees farming as a modified form of hunting. In farming the stalking is planting and cultivating culminating in the kill, harvesting. The 3-D brain of the early (aquatic) hominid could separate the "spacial" element of time of the events in farming to modify the "hunt". Time and relativity are not as well developed in the other primates: not to the extent that Homo sapiens have developed it to become the most efficient super competitive omnivore. It may be interesting to ask Elaine Morgan her opinion.

Of note, birds (dinosaurs) use a 3-D brain to enter another 3-D niche the air. While man who retained arms (and opposable thumbs) became more efficient in his niche, birds lost the use of "hands" and remained essentially dinosaurs (not "flying philosophers") simply pursing food as if land based. Man's 3-D brain was applied to other tasks: brainpower is never wasted or (Darwinian) the species dies off.

Using Elaine Morgan's concept V.T.T. has suggested mechanisms for evolution and a need for further research especially so because disease (viruses/bacteria) are central mechanisms and the modern world is creating huge amounts of raw sewage generating disease. But of theoretical interest are the genome CONSTRUCTS/PLATFORMS from which different forms are expressed as a response to environmental energy. We see life in new interrelated terms of efficiency and consumption. Therefore, although Elaine Morgan's aquatic Apeman fossil may never be found (as "real" evidence), time lines for the ungulate-whale evolution can be mapped as well as a fossil record for relevant diseases. Therefore, V.T.T. needs help to investigate these important concepts which will help understand evolution and good biotechnology: mechanisms for cell regeneration and other functions, possibly speeding up or even making Stem Cell research irrelevant.

Note: i.e., the mathematician, Galois presented important theoretical papers to the math peer journals of his day, and he was shabbily treated. Endocrinology (USA) has acted no better regarding the plagiarism of my work and may have helped to cover up fraud. Cronyism, as with Galois (and Barbara McClintock etc.) is a fact of scientific life, as is blacklisting. Therefore, ANY criticism of a lack of peer review is TOTALLY unacceptable. The scientific community (as with Mendel mailing out his work to so many) was widely asked for help. The Universities of Yale and Waterloo are compared to big bullies who flexed political connections and frightened everyone. I will not be criticized for the scientific community's lack of courage and integrity. Yes the presentation is over simplified, but NO ONE would help the research so I've forced to make do as best as possible, hence the method of public presentation. E.A.G.

3. Stem Cell Research Theory

The opening of the website addresses Michael J. Fox who is suffering from a serious illness, but it wonders if other avenues of research for cures may be blocked by many of the bad scientists and politicians I've been forced to deal with. This was not included rhetorically, but was quite serious with the documentation to prove it. An early (circa 1990-92) cloning research proposal, which I sent to many pharmaceutical companies and universities, was designed to understand cancer's mechanisms. To make a complicated theory short, cancer makes imperfect clones of the tissue it is operating on. Cancer acts on adult, fully differentiated cells of which any human already has their own supply of. To one pharma company I expressed the outlook that people requiring tissues or organs could simply grow their own once the research uncovered the mechanisms. The blacklisting blocked that research, and the public is invited to review the documentation.

On the other hand, stem cells are embryonic precursor cells, but are in limited supply: see opening of web site with concerns for human rights abuse and Asian call girls. If we breed babies for their stem cells like cattle or pre-Lincoln Afro slaves then the supply will not be so limited. There are countries that harvest murdered/executed prisoner organs just like butchering cattle, so why stop at babies?

The mechanisms to differentiate stem cells may take many years to uncover, and even then may require the same understanding as in the cancer mechanism. But with cancer

there are incomplete genetic sequences, and missing proteins. So by studying this mechanism, in competition with the stem cell researchers, genetic engineering may be perfected: i.e., specific location selection and precise gene splicing by limited directed vectors and the inclusion of the required proteins. Competition forces discoveries faster, and adult cells can be used so there is NO limit to a patients' supply of their own cells, and therefore NO ethical dilemmas.

My research proposals were sent to all the major pharmaceutical companies plus the federal governments. No help was offered, Mr. Fox, please tell me why? My explanation still stands, they want to use you like they use cancer patients to raise money. No matter how much they may protest that they must have i.e., human cloning for therapeutic uses like Stem Cells, or "top" researchers will leave the U.S. (to go where? Who has more money?), they do not want new research or honest competition! I have proven that. They want to sell degrees and receive grants (i.e., Yale and Riley) because they have blocked cancer research for 14 years. No, Mr. Fox, without public exposure, you may not get your miracle. If anyone disagrees, please Mr. Fox; get them to put it in writing because you will be surprised how few takers you will have.