

**Proximity Gestation**  
**In Relation To The Beginnings**  
**Of**  
**Species**

I don't believe that we were ever monkeys/apes. It just doesn't make sense to me.

Evolution in that sense? My answer is no. There are far too many other things that don't fit about it, and far too many other explanations as you soon shall see.... and from observations and research I have raised good questions with myself.... enough of a question to forward this work.

....one of which is "Why would Humans be the only thing to have such an extreme path of 'evolution' if it were that we began as apes?" Why would it only be our species with that much of a change?

I feel that we are much the same, save for small developments, as we were from our beginnings.

Look for a moment to insects. Bees, for instance... many have remained unchanged as far back as have been found. Look to their activities? All of their species are very consistent... though different types of the same thing. That "influence" on them (and us) comes from somewhere. I believe that it is a higher, more powerful existence/entity....an "Eternal Source" of that which gives animation/life. A "Body of Frequency" for the sake of illustration. We as creatures are nothing more than a resonation... a reaction to an action... Still in motion.

Look to creatures of the oceans/lakes/seas. Look at how they move with one another within their groupings.... nearly instantly they communicate subtleties in movement and other information....

I feel that much of it all, has allot to do with a form of "frequencies" (for the purpose of illustration).... those "frequencies," consistent over the centuries, have molded everything including our perception of reality, within those consistencies.

Creatures under the sea, have all been effected in the same manner, but below an opaque filter of these

frequencies-being the bodies of water....and have adjusted in their existence according to the consistent body of frequency that they have been exposed to at their depth, over time.

We have just found that creatures from the very depths of the ocean have no eyes. I don't think they failed to develop them... I think that they didn't get the information upon their gestation.... that instills the development of eyes..... the "opaque" filter of their environment "censored" that information in my opinion.

Think of it. Our differences as people/species of humans.... even as far as personality.... In my belief is dictated from that higher existence..... that working of consistent 'frequency'... with/and through the effect and process of Proximity Gestation....and from where it emits...( I don't believe it to be the sun... I see the sun as simply a singular part of a whole).

Since our planet was "formed"(which I have beliefs about as well), we have been in a consistent pattern of movement... through other consistent patterns of frequency. Many of which we have yet to even experience as a planet.

The formations in the sky at night, that we see as stars and constellations... are consistent sources of various different frequencies that have been effecting us since "day one" much in the same given pattern as they are today, as has the sun and other celestial bodies through "the broadcast/translation" of those frequencies... continuing them on their way from where they come..... and/or the "reflecting" of those frequencies..... the reflecting causing cross cancellation and "overtones" of false harmonies mixed within the "harmonies" of those frequencies that we already perceive (consciously or not).

This has been happening "for ever" in our perspective, consistently.

We know from science that ALL things are made up of vibration.

It is my belief that the differences in humans/species of humans... isn't from evolution... but more from development... exposure to different "harmony groups" of those frequencies over long periods of time... much in the same way that sea creatures developed differently at different depths and exposures. Differences being due to different proximity within that larger field in placement and as well from other physical influences on developmental stages. Different levels of different elements becoming present in various different degrees within initial gestation areas.

Given the origin of one land mass that has subsequently divided (the movement being scientific "truth" as well as fabled- the fact that it was fabled long before it was scientifically known, raises question with me about the popular time line and record), and in that division and movement has then seen different "frequency exposure" for those various different parts... "migrating" through and into different areas of that consistent and constant pattern of frequencies..... ... it very much stands to reason that creatures (and organisms) on those different pieces of "moving land," would begin to "develope" subtle differences based on the type of, and consistent body of frequency that they then found themselves in the "receiving area" of.... especially for long periods of time... which is very much the case. It would stand to the same reasoning that those differences would become more pronounced the farther from one another that they were moved... then becoming more susceptible and influenced from their immediate area/influences and newer proximity.

Those along the equator..... will show those traits more along and in line with the frequencies of the more dominant sun.... with lesser traits from the less dominant night frequencies (though frequencies from stars are still

there in the day time, they are just absorbed more and over influenced/cross cancelled from those of the sun)..... and they will also show more pronounced traits of the non human primate species due to the process of Proximity Gestation and subsequently their proximity to the areas most populated with those non human primate species (please see graph 1, diagram 2 and a map of natural non human primate range- old world and new world). This process occurs in all areas of the world, is perpetual and I believe began in the early stages of earth's formation... during the time of a singular land mass... or very near land masses.

....those farther away from the equator will show more traits in line with the patterns of the night "frequency" movements..... and traits more conducive to those non human creatures relative to their natural proximity. It is also found that there non-human primates more in tune with the "night patterns" than are other variations of 'non-human primates.' I do believe that day or night have little to do with similarity to humans in appearance, action. These things I feel are due to the 'elemental properties' of the given specimens physical make up, firstly... then as influence from those more subtle areas as 'sun/moon' qualities.

In a recent study from the 'Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society' it is stated that the Malagasy mouse and dwarf lemurs and the Afro-Asian bushbabies and lorises, all display what is referred to as a "disbursed harem" system in their pattern of social organization. I believe that these traits in these various different specimen are because of the reasons I have stated. Proximity and 'elemental percentage' influences - the various amount of given influences within their gestation proximity, and the amounts/percentage of the present 'elements' respectively (see graph 1- combined with diagram 3). This type of movement in social pattern is itself an emulation of that consistent process/movement within the process of Proximity Gestation and their given susceptibility as I have described.

Both of these types of influence vary in some degree given the season (and position in reference to the sun effect on our planet)..... as winter months are more dominated by the "night frequencies"..... while earth is in the path of the sun's orbit..... and summer months are more dominated by the radiation of the sun... while earth is in the sun's orbital tail. It is also subject to subtle differences in considering the climate changes over the centuries and eons... Which were very much due to a combination of shelf plate movement and proximity of the earth's early orbit, in the early stages of our sun's orbital path....

I believe that it is the "night Frequency" patterns, that lend us our more subtle traits.... more flowing traits....because of the greater variety and movement within those patterned frequencies and the more subtle presence of them. The "social traits" of the given examples within the Cambridge study are fairly good examples of the subtleties I am referring to. There is another abstract I would like to cite, which supports these subtle movements at a much smaller level. It is titled; *The distribution of pol containing human endogenous retroviruses in non-human primates* Written by; Greenwood, AD - Stengel, A -Erflle, V - Seifarth, W -Leib-Mosch, C ... and another (un related) titled ; *Long-term reinfection of the human genome by endogenous retroviruses* Written by; Belshaw, R -Pereira, V - Katzourakis, A - Talbot, G - Paces, J - Burt, A - Tristem, M ...and yet another unrelated abstract titled; *A HERV-K provirus in chimpanzees, bonobos and gorillas, but not humans* Written by; Barbulescu, M - Turner, G - Su, M - Kim, R - Jensen-Seaman, MI - Deinard, AS - Kidd, KK - Lenz, J..... and yet another titled; *Many human endogenous retrovirus K (HERV-K) proviruses are unique to humans* Written by; Barbulescu, M - Turner, G - Seaman, MI - Deinard, AS - Kidd, KK - Lenz, J ..... Though it is that the subject matters of these abstracts are fairly unrelated to one another... in specifics... it is that they serve to illustrate the more subtle (and even larger motion of the mechanism that I propose) movements and consistencies within the larger process. They are some

very telling examples of the process of Proximity Gestation... the movement of the process itself... many of these examples are very much similar to the illustration of diagram 3. Though it is that I do not believe these movements and integrations are what promote “change” per say, I do believe that they illustrate quite effectively the type of pattern movement within the process itself.... again, these consistencies are simply another level of emulation... continued resonance. These findings within these abstracts are related in the sense of being indicative of the “ongoing” process of Proximity Gestation...if nothing more. Entirely different viruses, acting and moving in largely a similar manner... the subtle differences being due to their “personal” proximity and elemental make-up as per the result of the given “fringe area” combination that yielded them.

Note that many of these examples are still being examined from a "linear" perspective, as opposed to that flowing motion of the process itself... as if to "gather" and separate the "differences" within the examples to then re-arrange in a “linear” manner, instead of examining them in the positions and "proximity" that they occur. The percentage "change" that is cited in a linear sense, may very well be relevant in a "proximity," breadth, peripheral, manner. The tendency seems still to be an attempt at connecting things/species in a linear fashion, instead of addressing their relations at a molecular level in an ‘atmospheric’ sense. "Width" of various related elements between species, not linear “change” from one species into another.

I would also like to cite the findings of the abstract titled ; *Many human endogenous retrovirus K (HERV-K) proviruses are unique to humans ...* This very much supports what I have been describing in relation to the effects of the process of Proximity Gestation. If it were that humans stemmed from ape in the manner as is the common belief, then it is that there would be no “uniqueness” in the way that this abstract addresses. These findings alone, serve very much as nearly undisputable evidence corroborating the process of Proximity Gestation. The support of an “event”

similar to what I have depicted in regard to “elemental exchange” and “fringe area” influences is very nearly overwhelming, simply in the title of this abstract. It further supports the idea that life for different species began very much in a “parallel” sense..... very nearly simultaneously.

"Evolve" suggest extreme's... so many connotations attached to that word... when there are many ( whoa! 'way lots') of example's where almost nothing has changed in some creatures.... "Evolved" suggests a "progress." Where what I am trying to describe is a matter of living....a process..... being effected from the same "pattern" over and over again.... like the sea on stones.... they aren't evolving, they are being subtly molded.....

Why would we be expected to believe that a given creature would have such drastic changes (as are suggested in popular theories), and other's don't? From a recent study of the Salmon Population in the Pacific Northwest of the United States of America, as per the Washington State University- Department of Natural Resources/Science and more particularly in reference to a recent abstract titled; *Maximum temperature limits for chinook, coho, and chum salmon, and steelhead trout in the Pacific Northwest* - submitted to isiknowledge.com by Richter, A and Kolmes, SA. - The abstract cites the changing water temperatures as a main reason for endangering of these species. If it were that creatures possessed some form of ability to “morph” and adapt to their surroundings....this abstract might be entirely different. Perhaps to the tune of tracking the changes which would supposedly occur within these species to accommodate their changing habitat. The sad part is, is that they are becoming extinct. Dieing off... not changing. This is a very good example of the effect of proximity. For all intent and purpose, they are being exposed to a new (different) proximity atmosphere than that which their elemental make up was devised within. They are no longer in a “harmonious relationship” with their surroundings. The lack of any attempt at adaptation is empirical at least, in regard to what I have stated pertaining to linear development being illusion.

Yes, I believe that I have found at least a good explanation and response to many questions.... especially many of those in the recent scientific direction of “evo-devo” as have been put forward in an abstract written by Arthur, W. titled; *The emerging conceptual framework of evolutionary developmental biology* I must say again, It seems that the misdirection is in approaching the subject from a linear perspective. Though it is that I am addressing an entire process which is much larger than any "evolution" aspect.... the appearance of "evolution," in my belief, is simply illusion from our perspective.... this illusion is as much because of our concept of time, as it is because of the concept of "linear development." There is no linear relationship of man and ape... only a "parallel" due to “cross pollination”- "elemental exchange" and only in certain strains of the species, within both species and sub-groups. The same "elemental exchange" in other ways, from different sources, can be seen in the human and ape, as well.... again, in varying degrees. This is due to proximity.... and the process of Proximity Gestation.

My personal opinion, is that Darwin missed a bit with the Finch thing and I also believe that Darwin failed to consider time as a human concept within his writing. I don't think the Finches "developed" those differences per say, as much as I think that those differences were there upon the conception of those different types of birds..... a combination of that "consistent frequencies" subtle differences, and the difference between the inseminating factors upon their creation..... Proximity Gestation. (Diagram 1, Graph 1)

In short, I think that most, if not ALL living creatures are from the "Egg." One form or another.

In an abstract written by Schmitt, S. from the International Journal of Developmental Biology, titled; *From eggs to fossils: epigenesis and transformation of species in Pander's biology*... he references the earlier studies of a Russian/German scientist named Christian Heinrich Pander (1794-1865), he addresses the importance of embryology.....and speculates upon the presence of “germ layers” which influence “evolution”....I propose that it is the process of Proximity Gestation itself, which would

influence those supposed germ layers..... and further in related abstracts "abnormal regenerations" are addressed. This aspect cites an example of the process of Proximity Gestation from a different perspective. In the same manner that these "abnormalities" occur, so go the influences of the process of Proximity Gestation. "Abnormalities" being purely subjective...especially regarding the "environment/proximity" of the given example. Factually, those specimen, variations of species that met demise, can be classified as "abnormalities" in the same respect (as can now the Salmon Species in the Pacific Northwest)... simply on a larger time frame. "schmitt-homeosis " In applying this to the situation with the problems concerning the salmon species.... A person could say, from that same perspective, that they are now nothing more than an "abnormality." Because of the change in environment, their physical existence is now equal to an abnormality. The only difference being perspective..... the atmosphere in which they existed, changed (is changing)- rendering them incompatible with the new atmosphere. This is really no different than something being *placed* into an atmosphere with "abnormalities" pertaining to the standard/normality conducive to the situation.

I feel that I should also point out, that it seems to be a standard in the more popular understanding of "evolution," to forgo addressing the lack of "adaptation" within examples such as these various salmon species going extinct. Especially since it is that the main reason is a change in climate. The very thing that many cite as reason for change in species. This is too great a contradiction for me to ignore. If it is that species have "evolved" in a manner that was at least partly for the purpose of "adaptation," then it is that there would be *some* reaction and change in the specimen regarding situations such as the given example. There isn't, that I can find or have heard of (other than dieing off). What's more, is that in regard to "extinction," it is so easily justified and ignored as it happens in our very midst.... But then is addressed as some mystery when in regard to historical findings... placement...reasons.... AND is then usually tried to be united in some linear manner with some other species/occurrence. As if there was some

“change” in the given creature/species that had gone extinct indicating it’s continuance in another form. I don’t understand the mystery in examining those situations. We are witnessing the extinction of species now. The reasons for it are not very relevant to the end result, therefore the process of extinction wouldn’t be that much different now. I seriously doubt that the occurrence was much different in ancient history. Because the Salmon species are dieing out, does not mean that all others will as well. It does not mean that they will be suddenly related to any of the other species that continue on.

I would like to cite the recent discovery (1999) of Neanderthal co-existing with “modern humans” in Central Europe to illustrate this point more clearly. They co-existed for around 1000 years according to the abstract and article. This means that “modern humans” came from somewhere other than some “change” of another creature- perhaps relative variation of the primate species (I should mention that in many ways we are again, witnessing the same type of situation in our very midst as the co-existence is said to have been). This entirely supports the idea of the process of Proximity Gestation. It entirely debunks the claims of life (human species) originating in Africa from a single specimen. It entirely debunks the claims and popular belief of some linear relationship between the variations of the primate species. It supports greatly as well, my opinion that life for species actually began in several places. If not simultaneously, then very near it... And in very similar manners, much of which have to do with that larger, ongoing process... and the result of it through emulation resulting in the various different species and the sub groups of them. This process I can find no other suitable title for than that of Proximity Gestation. This distinct possibility is further illustrated in a recent study performed in Antarctica. The findings were published in an abstract written by; *Shivaji, S -Reddy, GSN -Aduri, RP -Kutty, R -Ravenschlag, K -* titled; *Bacterial diversity of a soil sample from Schirmacher Oasis, Antarctica*. This abstract focuses on the diversity of bacteria’s present in the soil.... It also notes the similarities between the varieties present and those present in many other areas

around the world. It is cited that the bacteria diversity of this study is unique in that none of the examples belonged to the “uncultured Y, O, G, A and B groups common to all soil samples.” While it is that I am no molecular biologist, this indicates to me, within the diversity and subtle differences found to be consistent and consistent in difference... that even at the molecular level the indications of that larger process are very evident. It is this same type of diversity that I feel acts most within the “creation aspects” of the process of Proximity Gestation (as illustrated in diagrams 1-3) yielding in some cases the different types of species that we know of as living creatures... and in other cases having yielded those types of species we have found to have gone extinct... and even in other cases... yielding “natural attempts at existence” that didn’t ‘take’ in that respect.

In a study conducted pertaining to the “Dalmation Wall Lizard” and “Organisms, Diversity and Evolution”- abstract titled; *Mitochondrial phylogeography of the Dalmatian wall lizard, Podarcis melisellensis (Lacertidae)* - Written by; Podnar, M- Mayer, W- and Tvrtkovic, N - It found that the diversity of this species and it’s “sub-species” began in the “earliest Pleistocene” and I might add, is described in such a manner as to be conducive to the process I have described. I also have to note that there may be something more than coincidence in relation to the co-existence of “modern humans” and “Neanderthal” in this same time period- roughly. This study shows that there was some form of “divergence” of this given example of species in that time frame. It is also shown in other studies, that “modern humans” and “Neanderthal” existed together for around 1000 years... this as well can be seen as a “divergence” of sorts. I do not mean to suggest that one begat the other... what I am drawing attention to here is the fact that these apparent “changes”- developments as they are seen from our perspective in the modern day... are in the relatively same time period. From one perspective, it would appear that something quite drastic had happened unilaterally to inspire this “change.” Though it is that I do not believe something so drastic was solely responsible for this movement.... I do believe that it was of a “unilateral influence” in the form of that ongoing process. It is more

than coincidence when viewing the consistency of so many “changes” in a consistent time frame. In that, where can be seen any inspiration for an “adaptive” change to take place? Neanderthal gave way to a much less “hairy” and “animal like” creature... being the “modern human.” The attitude regarding “evolution” because of “adaptation” states that the change there-in would have been in a different direction than in “losing natural protective elements of the body,” and “losing superior size and strength.” In my opinion, what we consider “survival of the fittest” had nothing to do with these changes. Survival of the fittest suggests “adaptation,” adaptation suggests maintaining a “superiority” in the wilderness environment. Shorter and considerably more hairless versions of human, does not to me make for “superior survival elements” in a wild environment. Again, I find my answer in that larger process. The fact that so many “changes” seem to have occurred in the same time space supports this. The “wall lizards” didn’t necessarily “diversify” or “change.” More that elements from their make-up contributed to the process of other “fringe area” developments within gestation areas and proximity which proved to be conducive to producing other variations. This convergence of “changes” is really quite consistent in appearance throughout known history. It is definitely cyclical.... Ongoing..... re-occurring. And judging from my observations of the over all consistency, the time between these “births” will become consistently less and less. Essentially, those periods between such changes could be viewed as a type of “gestation” period. Eventually finding ourselves in a more immediate “response time” to our very influence upon the process of Proximity Gestation” through our existence. That is, we will, as will all other living creatures, have less “leeway” in what is contributed from our existence into that “gestation” and there-in upon that apparent “change,” “birth.” It could eventually become quite immediate given that the time between these “births” has consistently become smaller. This, I admit is a blend of metaphysical aspects as well as physical influence.

Even now, there are new strains of microbiological elements being discovered in vicinities which have been inhabited by other strains, traditionally. For example of

this, I will cite a recent abstract on a microbiological study in China. It is titled; *Streptosporangium yunnanense* sp nov and *Streptosporangium purpuratum* sp nov., from soil in China It was written by; Zhang, LP- Jiang, CL- and Chen, WX The two new strains discovered in this study are different than those of the same genus. It is stated that the study was conducted in a region with specific geographical conditions which contributes greatly to it's microbiological diversity. Again, I claim to be no micro biologist.... But to see this kind of “development” being of something larger in it's workings and consistency... doesn't take a doctorate. This illustrates a portion of the process I have been referring to..... Multitudes of different influences have existed in the same general proximity for much longer than we know of. I contend that within the “fringe areas” of their co-habitation, could be found just as many (if not more) “failed” (“abnormalities”), of examples pertaining to different or “new” strains. Some of these “new” strains surviving a considerable amount of time less than others within very similar “strains” to those that manage to continue. Some of the pre-existing strains, dieing off at similar points in time that others are just beginning... this without any “linear” relation to one another other than perhaps a slight contribution of “element” simply through their proximity, if that at all. Their “similarities” between “strains” being because of the elements within that given proximity and the effects of that larger process, and not due to any relationship with one another, linear or otherwise.

I believe that upon the creation of our planet (at it's molten stage and periodically since), it was "penetrated" from another/other objects (that I believe to be from a larger, broken up source- as are we).... those objects deposited elemental properties which combine in various ways through the process of Proximity Gestation with the make up of our "planet" at those points, even down to the micro-biological/molecular level..... these “elements” culminate and incubate, and gestate life in very rudimentary "egg" type of formations..... from the most rudimentary materials.... through the process of Proximity Gestation and that larger influence of an “Eternal Source.” As this occurs amid living creatures... it inspires subtle

divergence of them according to their proximity within the “disbursement radius” of those other influences. This isn't to say, that an impact must be necessary for this process to transpire.... As I have stated, I believe it to be an on going event..... there is really no “stop” or “start” to it.

This view stems from observation, study and knowing from experience that you don't even need a chicken to hatch eggs (I've done it and raised them),..... all that you need is simply warmth.... once the act of fertilization-insemination occurs (which we now know is possible in various manners)..... IT is simply a reaction which I feel could have happened upon those different impacts from other objects.... simultaneously cooling the molten area... and even catching some of that reaction in those rudimentary "Egg Shells." This has been achieved several times in a laboratory.... And artificial insemination occurs quite frequently.... It isn't a hard thing to envision and even less hard to believe once you have witnessed life emerging from a molded piece of calcium that has been kept warm for a considerably short amount of time (some twenty days) in regard to the value of the pay load of its purpose; being a living, breathing thing.

This could also account for the depiction of "God" making man from mud. But such is pure speculation... however entertaining the thought may be.... It is in a certain respect, possible insight into the metaphysical influences on the mind and knowledge....

It really isn't that far fetched.... The human/mammal gestation is simply an egg... a flesh and blood egg.... from the egg within having been fertilized. I should state that this occurrence (mammals) are living proof of the consistency of that larger process and our involuntary emulation of it. The fact of “egg” within “egg” if you can relate. This larger process I see as layered in similar manners.

Consider the remnants of a much larger thing, planet like... breaking up... a thing that had it's own orbital path and place within a larger consistency.... Something so big, that we as we are now, would be hard pressed even to locate and see it outside of our universe (which is in my opinion, the remnants of that larger thing).....ourselves (planet earth) being a part of that debris... even in it's molten form...(as I believe, is the sun as well- and consequently other stars).... smashing into the molten form of all of the planets in our solar system (which is simply the formed/cooled debris from the larger object... and perhaps early flare(s) from the sun)....

Consider that the "larger object" had some form of what we would call life..... even if it were just microscopic, at the time that it "broke apart." Then further consider that such debris still maintained some amount of those "spores" as it crashed into the cooling blob of our planet.

If you consider these things, and are familiar with just how basic the "egg gestation" really is.... it makes allot of sense.

"A confetti storm" of germinating materials, innumerable, simultaneously mixing with like wise innumerable variations of "host cells (egg cells)," inseminating and cooling to some degree, the area in which land was formed and "life began" on Earth..... creating germinated, "egg like" areas (on many levels) upon impact/exchange. This happening in several different areas.... But all very much in the same process of Proximity Gestation.

I have boiled eggs, in styrofoam cups, on open flames/beds of coals..... as long as there is water in the cup with the egg, the cup will sustain the direct heat and effect of Hot Coals and flames.

I have cooked with molded clay materials. I am sure

that a clay "container" could withstand even more extreme temperatures than can a styrofoam cup.....

I think the idea that those "finch's" evolved differently, is again.....just a small miss...( I don't mean that in a snooty, I'm smart way... it is only my opinion)... I think they have simply responded to that consistent frequency and their predisposed "combination" of the result of that "confetti storm" of molecular/make up... insemination..... "Proximity Gestation" and the effects of that process.

I don't believe that we all are really related in the sense of coming from the exact same set of creatures, at any given time....

I think that there were various/varieties of creatures of many different types.... some that you couldn't even recognize as creatures.... and some that were very similar to ourselves, today....

In a simple over view. I do not hold to the popular opinion that we have evolved in a linear manner from primates. With all of the consistencies in the world (and beyond), it just doesn't hold true. I believe that we began very similar to the way that we are now....with some rather subtle changes (most due to domestication and the development of technology), but in no way did we ever stem from monkey's/"other" primates.

My theory of Proximity Gestation makes allot more sense to me and even works well with some of Darwin's findings, though in a different manner than was his intent when he wrote those observations.

For instance I will again site the Galapagos Finches....(please see Proximity Gestation Diagram 1), and such I believe to be similar in regard to all creatures and species;

Again, I feel all species are of such a "Proximity Gestation" area...though as anyone can understand, there most assuredly were many different types of patterns... here (please see Proximity Gestation Diagrams 1-3) yet is another illustration.

I'll note that any who believe in creation OR evolution MUST admit that at some point there must have been "gestation" of some sort. Empirical evidence for this is everywhere and quite a normal aspect of existence.

Question; Where did these living organisms come from?

Could they have "developed" from a lifeless, molten substance? No is my answer to that. What then does that leave us? We know that such organisms did actually come into existence, as we can see the result even in our own existence... we would not be here if they hadn't. We know that this planet has been repeatedly bombarded with material's from other places (within our universe). Such is my immediate explanation for these organisms and their presence on this planet, that according to science began as a ball of molten material. In my belief it was these bombardments that actually began to cool that molten goop and brought such organisms to it. Continuing a much larger process while beginning it here on Earth.

The next question then is, "where" did these embryos gestate?

Could it be possible that they simply formed and gestated in a "sludge?" I don't believe so.

I believe that during such bombardments, many of these organisms were disbursed. Some into areas that proved to be sufficient to incubate during such a cooling

process, and some intermingled within that disbursement and with one another- hence "Proximity Gestation." Some areas even proving to be sufficient to store such organisms in a suspended animation, a slower developmental/gestation period.... being exposed over time to other influences- then germinating them and beginning that process of gestation into existence in another form.

I believe that in most cases in the very early stages of this cyclical occurrence, that the cooling substance and essentially, forms of mud (and in my opinion giving us the impression metaphysically of being made from mud in some instances), acted as containers for gestation. Science has proven that this is a distinct possibility through gestating embryos in artificial environments, and has even provided evidence that such intermingled organisms can actually develop....become fertile and achieve a form of insemination.... and really if you think about it, an egg shell is simply an arrangement of calcium. I know that it is a real fact that such gestation can occur without a host (someone/something tending the "egg"). All that is really needed is the temperature.

I believe that this "exchange" has occurred more than once here on earth. And as science tells us, such "bombardments" have, quite factually. One of which being cited as the reason for the death of "dinosaurs." I believe that there are even various combinations of substance gestating in a similar manner now, within a larger area of the process of Proximity Gestation, at a rate that we do not readily perceive though is demonstrated in the activity within the micro-biological realm as is illustrated within the studies I have cited. In accordance with the overall consistencies I have observed. I believe that our existence (and all that we know of it from the past) is quite factually part of that "larger gestation" on that much larger level.

In my belief, from study and deduction, those species that actually continued to exist from these gestating periods... did so and developed, again in conjunction with

proximity... but in this fold and meaning of proximity, due to a larger consistent influence on our planet (and all else). I liken that influence to an infinite body of frequency for the purpose of illustration. Omni-present. The various degrees of elemental make up within each emerging example/variation (creature) of any given gestation area, being the deciding factor as to the longevity of it's existence. That is to say, survival rate based on it's harmonious alignment and make up with the larger movement of existence. This accounting for the various examples of different elemental combinations within various different types of fossil findings, being found at the "time area" in which they were 'deposited.' Meaning that such would explain the dramatic differences between the different fossil findings of apparently related creatures, such as the 'Homo sapien - Hominid - Sahelanthropus tchadensis' for example. None really being relative to another except in the respect that their given element/substance combinations respectively, mortally failed to correlate with the larger environment and movement in a manner to insure their continuation. All being products of different "fringe area" combinations and result.

Here are some things that I feel serve as living (modern) examples of Empirical evidence substantiating the existence of the effect of Proximity Gestation;

- The Platypus ( monotremes )
- Marsupials
- The Bull Roarer (a common tool/instrument in North American Natives, as well as Australian Natives)
  - This is quite a curiosity to me as it points to a great inaccuracy in the established "time lines" as well as the established estimations of the Tectonic Plate movements. It also supports the idea of "interactive connectivity," mostly because of how unique the "tool" itself is, and it's use. It isn't the type of tool that can easily be said to have been coincidentally developed. It serves a unique purpose in communication as well as entertainment. Such a coincidence as two different cultures so far away from one another in distance AND physical similarities as well as ceremony developing the same type of communication devise is rather

uncanny. For different primitive civilizations to have developed something like the tool used to extend the volume of thrust on a projectile (spear) is readily explained from developmental “need.” To explain the existence of the Bull Roarer on two very distinctly different continents being of the same type of coincidental need, is akin to the hypothetical situation of someone finding a “pre-historic banjo” in India. The percentage possibility of a “coincidental developmental need” producing the Bull Roarer in such an extreme situation, is very slight.

- The Pyramids
- Egypt and Central America
  - Again... Proximity? Interactive Connectivity? Can the existence of such similar structures so far from each other in such vastly different cultures, be written off as coincidence? A person may immediately say that the “pyramid” is a basic shape discovered to be a suitable, early design for rudimentary construction.... Then I say, where in is the larger consistency in regard to that opinion? Why then only those two very extreme and different examples of such a “basic” and common means for architecture? I then will point out the areas of proximity in respect to both examples.
- The Finches
- The Polynesians/Easter Island

The Platypus, Finches and Polynesians are wonderful examples....and as if it weren't obvious, I don't need to assign certain species per representation within my illustrations....

From the recently issued abstract pertaining to the *Sahelanthropus tchadensis* (Toumai), Centre National De La Recherche Scientific;

The amazing fossil material discovered by the M.P.F.T. (1) (a nearly complete cranium, two lower jaw fragments and three isolated teeth), and described by Michel Brunet and his colleagues in the last issue of the journal Nature (2), is assigned to a new hominid, new genus new species, nicknamed Toumai (3). The new hominid, recovered from the late Miocene of Toros-Menalla (Djurab desert, northern Chad), is associated with a fauna the evolutionary level of which indicates a biochronological age close to 7 million years ago (4). The fauna is composed of aquatic and amphibious vertebrates, and also species inhabiting gallery forest, wooded savanna and grassland. Sedimentological

data are in agreement with this mosaic of environments, showing a vegetated perilacustrine belt between lake and desert (4). The new hominid displays a unique combination of primitive and derived characters suggesting a close relationship to the last common ancestor between Humans and Chimpanzees suggesting him as a likely ancestor of all later hominids. The geographic location of Toumaï, 2500 km west of the Rift Valley, and his great antiquity suggest an early pan African distribution of hominids (at least from 6 million years ago) and an earlier chimpanzee-human divergence (at least as early as 7 million years ago) than previously indicated by most of the molecular studies.

(1) The Mission Paléanthropologique Franco Tchadienne (Professor Michel Brunet, Dr.), a scientific collaboration between the University of Poitiers, the University of N'Djamena and the Centre National d'Appui à la Recherche (C.N.A.R., N'Djamena) includes forty scientists from ten countries. The M.P.F.T. leads an international and interdisciplinary research program on "early hominid origin and environments".

(2) Michel Brunet and M.P.F.T. (2002) A new hominid from the Upper Miocene of Chad, Central Africa. *Nature*.

(3) In the Djurab desert, babies born before the dry season are named Toumaï. This name has been suggested as a vernacular name for the new hominid by the highest Chadian authorities, it means "hope of life" in Goran language.

(4) Patrick Vignaud et al (2002) Geology and Palaeontology of the Upper Miocene Toros-Menalla hominid locality, Djurab Desert, Northern Chad. *Nature*.

From the New York Times, July 11, 2002;

**July 11, 2002**

## **A Fossil Unearthed in Africa Pushes Back Human Origins**

By **JOHN NOBLE WILFORD**

French scientists digging in Central Africa have uncovered a skull, virtually complete and almost seven million years old, that belonged to an individual about the size of a chimpanzee. It is, they say, the earliest known member of the human family, by perhaps as much as a million years.

The discovery, described in today's issue of the journal *Nature*, is being hailed as the most important fossil discovery in decades. Surprised by the age, complexity and geography of the fossils, paleoanthropologists spoke of the find as a critical and perhaps revolutionary turning point in the study of human origins.

The scientists said it was too early to know whether the skull represented a species on a direct ancestral line to

humans. In fact, the fossils — a cranium, two lower jaw fragments and several teeth — suggest an evolutionary complexity and diversity in human origins that seem to defy description by the simplified family trees of the past.

What is especially striking, and puzzling, is the skull's mixture of primitive and advanced characteristics. The braincase is apelike, but the face and teeth are more like those of a human. The cranial capacity is similar to that of living chimps.

The skull is of an age, scientists said, that it could be expected to provide telling evidence of life at the time the human and chimpanzee lineages diverged. Some of its characteristics suggest that the skull is closely related to the last common ancestor of humans and chimps and may yield an understanding of what those apelike creatures were like.

In the journal report, the discoverers called the skull "the oldest and most primitive known member of the hominid" family, close to the split of hominids and chimps. As such, they predicted, the find promised "to illuminate the earliest chapter in human evolutionary history."

At any rate, the specimen is sufficiently distinct from apes and other human precursors, or hominids, to be given a new genus and species name by the discovery team, headed by Dr. Michel Brunet of the University of Poitiers in France.

Its formal name is *Sahelanthropus tchadensis*, recognizing that all the specimens were found in the harsh desert region known as the Sahel in Central Africa south of the Sahara. More commonly, the hominid is being called Toumai, a name often given to children born close to the dry season.

"Toumai is arguably the most important fossil discovery in living memory, rivaling the discovery of the first 'ape man' 77 years ago — the find which effectively founded the modern science of paleoanthropology," said Dr. Henry Gee, Nature's

paleontology editor.

"This is really an extraordinary find," said Dr. Ian Tattersall, an expert on fossil hominids at the American Museum of Natural History. "It broadens our perspective in two directions — in time and in geography."

The absence of volcanic ash layers at the fossil site prevented the discoverers from dating the specimens in absolute terms and with the usual scientific methods. But a comparison of other fossils found at the site with similar ones from well-dated sites in East Africa yielded an estimate of six million to seven million years for the Chad fossils.

"It's seven million years old, so the divergence between chimp and human must be even older than we thought before," Dr. Brunet said.

Molecular biological studies have indicated that the divergence occurred five million to seven or eight million years ago. Although the research is controversial, *Orrorin tugenensis*, a specimen reported in Kenya two years ago, had until now claimed the title of earliest hominid, at about six million years. An *Ardipithecus ramidus*, which lived about 5.8 million years ago in Ethiopia, was a close competitor.

So the Chad discovery opens a window on a fateful period in evolutionary history about which the fossil record has been so sparse that the remains could fit in a shoebox.

Also, none of the other early specimens include almost complete skulls, which are considered more revealing of a fossil species' place in the hominid family. Toumai is about three million years older than the next-oldest hominid skull.

The discovery site, in the Djurab Desert in Chad, is more than 1,500 miles west of the more familiar fossil beds of East Africa, in Ethiopia, Kenya and Tanzania.

As Dr. Daniel E. Lieberman, a Harvard paleontologist, said: "We've been looking exclusively in East Africa

and South Africa and basing our evolutionary tree on what we find there. Brunet has reminded us that we must find out what was going on in Central Africa and West Africa, and that's going to be harder to do because of more difficult environmental conditions."

In studying the skull, Dr. Lieberman recognized a third reason, besides the specimen's age and location, for scientists to be excited and challenged by the discovery. That is the skull's mosaic of primitive and advanced characteristics.

"You expect something that age to be very chimplike," Dr. Lieberman said. "But this one's face is the face essentially of a *Homo habilis*, at two million years ago, and yet this face is almost seven million years old."

This is all the more puzzling because *Australopithecus afarensis*, the Lucy species that lived 3.2 million years ago, has a decidedly chimp like face. What's happening? Reversing evolutionary patterns and trends, Dr. Lieberman said, is "extremely rare, if not impossible."

Several scientists said the discovery thus seemed to undermine the simplest linear models of hominid evolution. If the earliest hominids like Toumai were directly ancestral to australopithecines like Lucy, Dr. Lieberman pointed out, there would have had to have been two reversals to reach the advanced characteristics of the *Homo* lineage.

Otherwise, he added, Toumai is ancestral to some other hominids that then gave rise to the *Homo* species, in which case australopithecines are a side branch outside the human ancestral line.

In an appraisal accompanying the journal report, Dr. Bernard Wood, a paleoanthropologist at George Washington University, favored a "bushy" model of hominid evolution over a simple linear model. The many branches reflect evolutionary diversity in response to new or changed circumstances.

So Dr. Wood said the bushy, or untidy, model "would predict that at six to seven million years ago we are

likely to find evidence of creatures with hitherto unknown combinations of hominid, chimp and even more novel features."

Dr. Wood further predicted that Toumai was "just the tip of an iceberg of taxonomic diversity during hominid evolution five to seven million years ago."

One important question is whether the newfound fossil species stood upright and regularly walked on two legs, which has been a defining aspect of hominid behavior. The discovery team has yet to find any skeletal bones associated with Toumai.

Dr. Brunet, the team leader, said the position where the spine entered the head "doesn't prove that he is bipedal, but it shows he could be."

Firstly, in regard to these findings, I must state that I see no "fossil gap." I don't believe that there is a "fossil gap." I see this more as a type of that "gestation period," a time between the cyclical occurrence of that process. I think the illusion of such a thing, is due entirely to the pre conceived idea of a linear development, morphing of species in general, one into another. As I have stated, I do not find this to be the case in regard to human development especially. I believe that the illusion of the "fossil gap" is further due to the effect and result of Proximity Gestation and the lack of recognizing it's effect and process until now.

In regard to the questions posed within the newspaper article;

Please refer to the area in which "Toumai" existed/was discovered, in comparison to the known "Primate Areas" in regard to proximity of 'old world' and 'new world' primate development. Then refer please to the series of diagrams I have created in regard to the idea of Proximity Gestation; Diagrams 1, 2, and 3. Then please refer to the graph that I have created titled Graph 1. Then consider what I have proposed in regard to the process of Proximity Gestation in relation to the physical aspects of such findings as "Toumai (*Sahelanthropus tchadensis*)"

and that which I have presented in regard to consideration of ‘simultaneous development’ in several areas.

I present an idea that is supported through overwhelming findings throughout the scientific community in many areas. As well as through overwhelming consistencies one may simply observe. This idea which I have titled “Proximity Gestation” is in regard to all species and the physical process of their beginnings, and it extends into the realm of metaphysical properties as well. It is a term that describes a process that I find in an incredible amount of consistency throughout our existence (and beyond it), the results of which can be seen in creatures both alive today, and in the remains of creatures that have lived in the past.

I believe that the “chimpanzee like” size of “Toumai” is due to the fact that it’s larger influence in regard to Proximity Gestation, was the ‘other’ primate side of the proposed “Fringe Area.” (please refer to ‘Graph 1’)

I hold that the idea of any perceived linear development is an illusion created mostly from a lack of different perspective. This illusion was fortified with the early observations of man in regard to the origins of humans, other creatures and existence through following what may have seemed to be the obvious direction in research and perspective. This began with Aristotle, I believe. This isn’t to say that some creatures are different today than similar creatures were in the past... it is only to say that there is no specific linear relation in the course of development there-in. I propose that within the considerations of the effects and result of Proximity Gestation, that all known different examples of human/primate relation are not as is commonly perceived (being some linear relationship), but are in fact only separate examples of the varying results within the effect and process of Proximity Gestation. Please refer to diagrams 1-3.

I will also cite that the effects and process of Proximity Gestation are readily seen in the various different types of ‘other’ primates as well, much in a similar manner as in regard to “Darwin’s Finches.” Please refer to diagrams 1-3.

It is quite simple to see the similarities of humans and other primates, even in our modern day. Such is the perception I am referring to. I hold that it is not through any linear relation of humans and other primates that is the reason for these similarities as is continuously suggested in statements such as “chimpanzee-human divergence.” I hold that these similarities are due entirely to the effect and result of the process of Proximity Gestation between two (or more) entirely different fertile elements. This given the effect in appearance of some linear connection. I hold that the present state of all other creatures is due entirely to the effect and result of Proximity Gestation as well.

The human “strain” and the “other primate” strain were gestated in a close proximity at given times, “Fringe Areas (see the shaded areas in diagrams 1-3)... thus yielding the result and illusion of some linear relation. From my perspective, again I must state that I find such leanings as to the “linear” connection, to be false (at least in the “developmental change respect). I support this through the knowledge of other “Fringe Areas” of Proximity Gestation in relation to the human and other creatures as well as other creatures in relation to other different creatures (as is supported in recent molecular studies), though it is that such may not seem as pronounced as was/is the Proximity Gestation area(s) between the Human and the Primate, it is that such a disposition is due again to the lack of acknowledging the process itself.

I contend that the reason for a lack of further developed fossil finds, is due much to the areas in which are being explored. In my opinion, I believe that similar fossils to “Toumai” (and other examples) are yet to be discovered in the South American continent... and even

further, I believe that more advanced fossils of similar age are yet to be discovered in other areas of the world. This I support through the knowledge of the movement of Earth's Tectonic plates and through the knowledge of incredibly similar traits in cultures continents apart, separated with vast oceans in the time that it is speculated in which they supposedly 'traveled.' I also attribute the lack of more advanced fossil findings, to the fact that the creatures remains which are sought, themselves were "more advanced." This meaning that they had already developed 'post mortem' ceremony and proceedings. For instance we know of some cultures that have employed cremation as far back as is recorded in their culture..... some even interring the remains into the oceans.

In addressing the idea of some sort of "migration," I would think that much more would be found in the respect to fossil remains of these "migrating people" along the path(s) that allegedly were their course if it were that "migration" were the means of disbursement of humans.

I surmise, that it is very much a possibility that the different variations of the human species, "hit the scene" very near simultaneously in various different places. This would explain to me the obvious difference in "change" between many of the living examples of human species today. Due entirely to their given proximity of existence and relation to various different deposits of other elemental influence on those initial gestation periods. This concept is supported through recent findings of different molecular "presence" in different races of humans. Granted, it is widely known that there is a very large percentage relationship between humans and other primates. I have to stress that in my belief, again, this is due to the human elemental influence in that initial disbursement of "elemental" influences... this is supported in those findings... through the fact that there are other "relationships" within various examples of the human strain, with other living creatures. I believe that the largest misconception within the popular belief pertaining to "evolution," is in having assumed that the

high percentage of relation with other primates meant that humans had stemmed from “other primates” in some manner. This assumption and line of “logic” would mean that the presence of other molecular, genetic elements having relation to other creatures within various human gene structures...meant that somewhere along the line, a creature which then went on to mate with some form of primate, is also a considerable place to attempt to trace our “evolution” in a linear sense. I may be a bit eccentric at times, but never have I even dreamt that a “pig,” or “fish” or “lizard” or even a “plant” or any of the other prominent examples of elemental presence within various human strains, mated with a chimp or better yet, a great ape... (unless it was in Michael Jacksons back yard, that is- and even in that, such would not have occurred in a sufficient time frame to prove worthy)... and further still, begat a living, functional creature that then went on to do some similar thing in continuing our “development.”

It isn't possible, obviously. In that, the logic of all humans having stemmed from one primate/source, is not possible. In that popular opinion there is no explanation for the presence of so many other properties within the human make-up. To continue such belief on a grand scale is really not even within the spirit of science to begin with... much less within the spirit of philosophy, on which and from whence science came.

In regard to different races of humans and their existence. It is that we are all humans. Cognitive thought is that which separates us from the animal kingdom, regardless of race. Within that existence of being human, there are, as I have established, different levels of influence from what appears to be (in our perspective) other creatures/animals. This isn't necessarily true, as those other creatures are not entirely of “themselves” either. They are very much of and a product of that process of Proximity Gestation. At the best/worst, it is that all humans/variations of that species have a lesser or greater percentage relation to a given animal example within our existence and manifestation of being human. This scientific fact supports my opinion that it is very much backwards thinking to insist that the large

percentage of similarity with other primates is because of primates. Suggesting that it is some how because we developed from them. I feel that I must again state, that those similarities are because of the human element influence on the other elemental properties that comprise the various different species of primate. And again, I feel I must re-state that within those greater/lesser percentages of influence are the examples (some of which can still be seen in living humans) of a closer or farther proximity from the given “fringe area” in the process of Proximity Gestation... pertaining to a greater or lesser elemental presence within the given human/animal example. An animal (such as primates) which were closer to the “fringe area” of influences such as the human element, will and do display great similarities - to a greater or lesser degree. The same holds true for those human strains which progressed, having been closer to “fringe areas” of other elemental influences during those gestation periods (please see graph 1). This has happened between other species as well. Hence the similarities in different species of birds (and consequently their more subtle differences).

This exemplifies the variation within any grouping of "proximity" of 'activity,' reaction/motion within that larger process. The interaction of these specific elements... and the apparent change within the structures themselves stems from that larger movement within the process I have described. The illusion of "progression" is just that.... it is more in the likes of "gestation." As per a fetus in the womb for instance... isn't "evolving" in the popular definition of the word... it is gestating.... forming... progressing through an ongoing process.... responding as a whole, very much to the same body of "frequencies" at an entirely different level. Where the "single" example of cell movement can be seen as a 'violin,' the development of the fetus (as example), is the entire orchestra in tandem. No "linear" change from one type to another. Just a progression of the elemental ingredients present. This holds true within the overall consistency, throughout physical existence. When a person "blows up a balloon" it expands and fills uniformly according to the "elemental properties" of it's given form before it is filled. It doesn't change into a Mercedes when it is inflated. It remains as a

collection of the present elemental components within it's initial area of influence. It remains a "balloon" though is now much different in appearance from the pre-gestation version of it. We as a physical existence, are very much in a perpetual (seemingly) process of gestation, in relation to something much larger... within the larger workings of the process of Proximity Gestation.

I would like to attempt to place another proximity in regard to flying squirrel populations of Japan, Alaska, and the Pacific Northwest of the United States of America (the Pacific Rim). In research, I have found studies (non related) which serve to illustrate what appears to be the “un-observed” fact which I am putting forward at this moment. In an abstract titled; *Evolutionary diversity and ecology of endemic small mammals of southeastern Alaska with implications for land management planning* Written by Smith, WP in regard to maintaining forest habitat in Alaska.... The genetic differences between several different “mammalian taxa” were cited as: “*some reputed endemics showed nominal levels of genetic divergence from other conspecific populations, but more divergence existed among several taxa than was reflected in the current taxonomy. Furthermore, the mammal fauna of southeastern Alaska has a nested structure with complex phylogeographic patterns suggesting multiple colonization events. Of eight taxa examined through phylogeographic analyses. five species showed acute genetic variation and divergence in mitochondrial sequences. Four species were comprised of coastal and continental clades. Conversely. the northern flying squirrel (Glaucomys sabrinus) and southern red-backed vole, (Clethrionomys gapperi) were represented by relatively shallow divergent lineages. Still, G. sabrinus showed a distinct mitochondrial lineage on 11 islands (Prince of Wales Island complex), which exhibited severely reduced genetic variation. Moreover, flying squirrels in southeastern Alaska are genetically distinct from populations in the Pacific Northwest; as different as each is from the southern flying squirrel.*”

This shows a very distinct pattern of “formation” and existence..... “sub-groupings” that are really quite similar to one another in the respect to their formation and

dynamic. With the patterned genetic differences falling within these larger consistencies, a person almost has to begin to consider a larger mechanism being of primary influence.

To this I then add the results of another recent study on similar types of mammals in Japan. This abstract is titled; *Phylogeography of the Japanese giant flying squirrel, Petaurista leucogenys, based on mitochondrial DNA control region sequences* and was written by ; Oshida, T - Ikeda, K - Yamada, K - Masuda, R Note that each of these studies were conducted for different reasons, using similar types of information... And yielding very similar results on a certain level... there is an over all consistency in the results of both of these unrelated studies. Here are some of the pertinent results in this regard, from the Japanese study ; *Phylogenetic relationships reconstructed using neighbor-joining and maximum parsimony methods indicated that P. leucogenys is essentially separated into three major lineages: Group A consisting of a single haplotype from Kyushu, Group B consisting of some haplotypes from Kyushu and one haplotype from Honshu, and Group C consisting mostly of haplotypes from Honshu and Shikoku. Animals with the Kyushu haplotypes were split into two lineages (Groups A and B), suggesting that Group A diverged at an earlier point from the other groups. Genetic distances in Group C were not related to geographic distances between sampling localities, indicating that ancestral populations of this group recently expanded their distribution in a short time, possibly after the last glacial stage.*

It isn't hard to see the overall consistency here. I contend that such consistency continues hyperbolically in either direction - "in ward (molecularly)" or "outward (exponentially larger)." I do not think that this pattern is due to any "adaptability" or any "linear movement" in "evolution." I think it is entirely because of the reasons I have put forward in relation to that larger body of influence and the process we absorb it through, being the process of Proximity Gestation. These two very different studies, find the same consistencies within respect of

their proximity. I could speculate that the assumption of time frame being the “last glacial stage” could be inaccurate given the proximity of the Alaskan variations of “small mammals.” And noting that there “divergence” has been very similar. I can cite the difference of the molecular make-ups between the given examples as due to their proximity and area’s of other “elemental influence.” The particular differences in their biochemical strains and “divergence” patterns... being due to proximity... the larger influence in regard to their placement within it and perhaps movement through it in the more subtle shifts of the Tectonic plates.

The larger point that I am making here, is that if there were no effect from what it is that I claim, being the process of Proximity Gestation.... Then it is especially given the overall similarities of the creatures, that none would have had any type of “divergence” without the presence of such a larger influence. Without the concept of Proximity Gestation, all of these creatures would be nearly precisely the same in just about every way. This stands as empirical in regard to the existence of such an influence. A person cannot deny the differences within these “sub-species”... and similarly a person cannot deny the similarities. If a process such as what I have described were not a substantial influence upon the organisms of these creatures, they would all be precisely as are the others in regard to “divergence,” “disbursement” and biological make-up. This is easily applied to the human creature and even to its’ supposed relationship with other primate species, as well as all other living varieties of organisms within our world.

Again, I contend that approaching this from the perspective of some “linear movement” is mistaken. Linear suggests a time frame. Time is a human concept involuntarily derived from emulation of that larger influence and process.... It simply doesn’t apply. It doesn’t apply even more-so given the manner in which it is perceived. In a metaphor, the emulation in which time is of that larger process... that process of Proximity Gestation.. is very similar to the components of a clock. The process itself is similar in that manner. Each small

wheel... each large wheel... each little spring... Rocker arm.... All contribute to the perceived result to a greater or lesser extent.... As fleeting as that momentary combination of “elements” is, which yield that perceived result... ever changing. The tendency of humans is to look at and follow the motion of the “topical” result... the obvious motion of the clocks “hands” and workings as opposed to looking “into” that movement even at the molecular level. Evaluating the given contribution per element present in the topical/obvious structure.... Not recognizing the depth and breadth particulars as well as the immediate implications. None of the wheels and sprockets of any given clock are necessarily related. Factually they are very much of their own existence... and even origin.... Very much of their own and as result of their own exposure and existence within that larger process... the process of Proximity Gestation.

If you choose to look at it from a certain perspective, it can be said that each individual, each species, sub-species, organism.... And even processes, are as such. Very much comprised of elements that have combined to yield the perceived results.... Consistent in their motion and illusion of change... that perceived change being as contained as is the change of and on the face of a clock. No more relevant really, than the process of aging. Simply misunderstood and viewed from an improper perspective. It is the consistency, however inconsistent are the components in appearance, which all things we know of are made of/through and to serve as a part of. It is the resonation and reverberation of the consistency and component/elemental “wheels” that comprise that “Eternal Influence.” It is infinite. Exponentially larger than anything we could ever imagine. Infinitely smaller than anything we can ever discover. We, as creatures can only hope to understand the workings of it in my opinion... we can never hope to actually map and/or control it... as our existence is already “*behind the pitch*” in that sense. ANYTHING we could hope to examine, is already so far from the initial “wheels and sprockets” which contributed to it’s manifestation as nothing more really, than another element within it. In that, all that we could ever hope to attain, is again, the understanding of it’s consistent inconsistency. Even that, being that it is a

process itself, will not be possible to attain in full. It's "components" are subject to the very same consistent, elemental exchange.

However consistent the appearance of any given example is... within that example are components which have their own consistency.... Within that example those components are consistently changing in respect to their own reaction to that larger process, as do the positions of "wheels and sprockets" within a clock. Within that, the components of those wheels and sprockets are again subject to their own result as per the very same "process" from which they were derived. And further, each of those components has it's area within it's own situation within that process of Proximity Gestation.... And so on.... None of this necessarily in a linear manner. None of the resulting effects from a given isolated example within a noted "specimen (such as a clock)" necessarily having any effect or relation to anything else in that degree. None of the moments in life are exactly the same... though it is that the cycle of the topical elements of a clock remain "apparently" repetitive in their motion. The fact that no two moments are precisely the same, is living, empirical evidence that regardless of how consistent a clocks motion is (example of that process motion within Proximity Gestation), the elements that truly influence and contribute to each moment/second/split second, have changed to a given degree....even though it is that topically they seem to remain the same....even seem to remain in the very same cycle, predictably.

This example of the illusion of predictability serves, in my mind to illustrate the misunderstanding and misinterpretation in regard to findings concerning the idea of "evolution." It is that illusion of "predictability" which leads us to topical results in our observations of that perceived movement. The influence of our everyday perception (the conditioning to it), transferring into our perception of these types of subject matter. This isn't to say that I believe all the existing research and findings are useless or inaccurate....and it isn't to say that there is no amount of predictability....only that they have been misinterpreted pertaining to the amount and depth of

information that they could very well yield from a different perspective. This being due to perception....and the apparent progress of topical results (that “predictability”).

The clocks movement is consistent. Our every moment(s) is quite different, yet very consistent.... each and every one of them. This means that each of those consistent wheels and sprockets can be seen as representing an entirely (and infinite) different combination of “elemental make-up” each and every measurable amount of perceived time. Each and every one of them contributing to that specific moment of example, in every measurable amount of time. That contribution however large or small of each wheel/sprocket, resulting in a reaction which is manifest as only a part of that difference we can perceive. Each of those areas of contact being representative of “Fringe Areas.” Each of those “Fringe Areas” (even as they change constantly), contributing to the motion of that larger process.... Each result, becoming a percentage part of the result of another “Fringe Area,” so on and such.... Our perception of that “topical consistency” which is the representation of a given moment in time, is only a given point within the process itself. Subjected to our perspective of understanding, ONLY through and from our own perception. Our existence (as all else) is only a changing wheel/sprocket within the changing working of that larger process. Resulting, as in our perception... a similar perception of result, somewhere after our contribution to that larger process.... And then further on, and on, such and so forth. In very little of a linear sense.

As a musing, envision those “sprockets and wheels” as “spherical” in shape.... with the ability of universal movement within that placement (however long or short in “time”)... the envision the movement of the “clock” face, itself, as spherical.... The hands each bisecting the sphere of the “clock face body.” It’s an interesting visual.

I happened upon another very interesting visual just today. To view the workings of this “mechanism”

(Proximity Gestation) a bit more clearly...in a “time lapse” manner... all a person need do is watch a pool or puddle of water during a rain storm. What it is that I see in this process, is very similar to the infinite combinations and placement of rain droplets as they enter the pool/puddle, ripple and dissipate. Each establishing “fringe areas” with other “points of entry” during that cycle.... And within the larger changing cycle..... To then attempt to apply this visual to the larger scheme all a person need do is envision this process in a three dimensional sense.... And then again layered upon itself over and over again.... Exponentially larger, and infinitely smaller each manifestation of this containing it's own capacity in the same respect... that is, the process itself continuing in the same manner and consistency/inconsistency... within each instant.... And again within those ... and so forth.....

From my own perspective and opinion, I would say that it is as though the scientific community consistently regards results of experimentation as do we all, as the face of a clock. No matter how intricate, involved are the findings... they seem always regarded with the same perspective as does a time piece. This applies to the idea of “evolution” and findings pertaining to existence, as well. Flat. Topical... regardless of the amount of complicated information gathered.

With that, I suppose it is that I have sufficiently illustrated my observations and sufficiently have provided corroborating evidence in support of my findings. I got very easily continue to cite example after example... but such would be entirely redundant and without use. I feel that it is overly obvious, in regard to the stability of what it is that I have presented. I also feel that it is a rather unique perspective and one that I know I will find just as useful in my future “explorations of existence.”

Again, I feel that I should stress the fact that this concept is “a process.” An ongoing process. It is in no way linear in dominance.... It is very much unilateral, universal in movement. It can't be purchased. It can't be

contained. It can't be avoided or 'escaped.' It is omni present. It is of our every nuance. It is consistent.

So.....Do you like rubber chickens?

How do you like those rubber chickens?