



The Ultimate Biosentience: Wares the hard in all this soft? An unsolicited part 3 for SNS

In order to understand the sensual interaction between neurons and objects we need to start with the right question: What does this intersection *feel* like?

### Stem cells and objects

How does one unit, like a cell, become not only itself, but integrated into a pre-existent, interactive conglomerate of other units? The cell must be caught in some tensioned form of attunement to the sensation of its environment. If the tension of this attunement to feelings is what progressively causes the sequential morphogenesis of its apparent being, how does its own alteration of form integrate with something alien like a conglomerate of others?

The feelings from interaction with this conglomerate must already be familiar to similar newcomers, where sensations of these others are somehow an interpretable and translatable phenomena that follows their presence. These intersections are exactly what precipitate the transformations and integration of individual cells into the manifold contextures of their recognizable environs.

### Ontogenesis and genomic metaplasticity

If familiar sensations of others are what successfully launch individual cells into the contextures of their environ, what underlying substance is responsible for this causation? It's as though there is some latent memory roused following the presence of something otherwise familiar.

Are these sensational memories functionally coded components of design or an individually withdrawn history of being composed by interactive caricatures of others? Both readings of this phenomena would end up being symbiotically mediated by the sensual presence of objects, so its actually not important to distinguish them. But, I will anyway.

Here, interactive presence precipitates the epigenetic methylation of a genome, occurring inside both individual cells, and, by sensational mediation through a network of familiars, collectively.

*This* is why the methylome of neurons is the largest known assembly of integrating sensational memories, their specifically familiar interactive contexture is unlike any other found by the manifold methylome of organisms.

### Gyrogenesis

Cows, killer whales, bears, elephants, horses, sheep, llama, humans, hyenas, and other mammals have brains that gyrate. What beyond the genestic interaction in collectives of sensually integrated brain cells causes the progressive morphogenesis into an apparent being

like a folded brain? Well, what does a brain feel when first becoming itself? The most rapid phase of morphogenic ontogeny, the initial becoming of its withdrawn history of being.

Wouldn't this original circumstance become the same sensual conundrum that all brains, and the objects wrapped inside them, encounter throughout their existence? So then is gyration the organizational, metagenetic remembrance by brains to familiar alterations in the contexture of their environ? Like what its most immediate other, its body, actually feels like?

Here [biomechanical topography](#) and [mathematical modeling](#) overlay patterns on images of brains. But the apparent causation of this phenomena, as it happens in this instance especially, is illusory in a way that continues to withdraw from attempts that simply reduce the inertia of brains to the interaction of specific internal materials. Internal material interactions like say, [neurogenesis in the cortex](#)?

Maybe it makes more sense if the becoming that initially occurs during ontogenesis is seen as continual. After initially becoming attuned to what was familiar for the withdrawn history of its phylogenic genome, an organism encounters that which it never had. This would be the case especially in a place like brains where just alterations in their internal environ characterize only half the appearance of their extended becoming. Minds aren't simply brains.

So what are *minds* feeling all the time? sensual conundrums at the intersection of it and others? When you're conscious, you're always conscious of *something*. What *is* that something? your self? the environment? what *is* an environment? Everywhere you look for an environment there are objects, things, entities, *beings* immersed in the same reality. Is it the presence of these things in combination with itself somehow what brains are always feeling?

Now *that* is a paradigm shift in perception that puts raw sense data as something *following* objects themselves.

How is it that brains morphogenically interact with interactions with objects? Surely its something like an attunement to the presence of others through some withdrawn ontogenic familiarity with the contexture of its environment?

[Presence at hand](#), or the feeling of alteration had from things in the context of familiarity, is not only what new-coming cells feel of others when integrating into the pre-existing contexture of familiar conglomerates, but also what minds feel when presently integrating into the pre-existing, alien contexture of objects that compose their environment.

How is it that brains morphogenically interact with interactions with their own feelings? Something like an attunement to attunement as if attunement itself was an object?

That sounds a lot like [meditation](#) doesn't it?

But wait, there's more ;)

How is it that a brain morphogenically interacts with interactions with the feelings of things other than itself? Something like an attunement to how objects actually sensually interact with one another in the pre-existent, but alien, contexture of reality?

That sounds a lot like what [Einstein](#) was feeling. Where present sensations were so immersive that the alien feelings of objects were organizationally hallucinated until they became as sincerely familiar as his own.

So what is pattern-recognition? By now it can't be a coded computation of raw sense data. It must be something like organizationally focused attunement to the feelings of altering presence while immersed in reality. This is where patterns become the *appearances of what is* and recognition simply follows these sensational realizations of novel sincerity.

Whoa, that *is* starting to sound familiar..

And *this* is why brains gyrate. These phenomena are a conglomeration of brain cells' withdrawn, organizationally sensual remembrance of the focused attunement to present sensation itself. Likewise, gyration *doesn't end* at some predetermined age, but is *always* caught in the midst of a mind's interaction with itself and with objects other than itself.

### **Is there some central mechanism in the midst of this?**

This line of questioning places [environmental enrichment](#) in the central organizational position of all neuroscience to date. This is exactly the intersection of interactions involving the morphogenic alterations of metagenesic attunements to the pre-existing contexture of an alien environment. Interaction between cells and cells, cells and networks, networks and brains, brains and objects, and organisms and objects all somehow organize their becoming through the the presence of others, however initially familiar.

This is why brains exist to begin with, not because some teleological function of coded design efficiency *became* in the face of natural selection, but because sensations precipitate metagenesic evolutions of becoming to resolve unfamiliar alterations of presence. Just like beaks, amidst the withdrawn methylome manifold of galapagos finches, symbiotically recollect the altering presence of seeds. Here, metagenesic becoming *is* evolution.

*And* the reason this phenomena is central to neuroscience isn't because the revealed physical components of nervous systems fit together as such like puzzle pieces, but because a symmetrical phenomena is *central to reality*. The sensual intersection of objects is exactly where the drama of the cosmos unfolds. Objects are wrapped in objects, always caught in the midst of interaction with themselves and with the presence of objects other than themselves. *That* is the central causal mechanism in the midst of this. Ontogenesis is *object-oriented*.

[Metaplasticity](#) belongs right here. Just like in environmental enrichment, the interobjective orientation of objects to organisms is central. But unlike enrichment, where optimal conditions for sensational becoming are paramount, the orientation of organisms to objects is altered here in such a way that molests conglomerations of cells' orientation to sensation.

This is where a vexing sensual conundrum of some specific environmental contexture is irresolvable to the extent that these beings change how they interact with the presence of objects all together. And it's because of [inescapability](#).

Isn't this what sets apart organisms to begin with? how encounters with vexing conundrums, in however alien an interobjective scenario, are resolved? Doesn't this sound a lot like the rhythms that minds are caught between when interacting with the presence of themselves and objects other than themselves? The exact same tune that gyration dances to? The same timbral echo that ambiently phases amidst objects inside brains?

So what then is familiar to the withdrawn history of being to begin with? Safety within the manifold contextures of recognizable sensations? or here, is it *death* that's actually familiar in the most strangely intimate way? It is as if this tensioned feeling coagulates autonomous metagenesic attunements to present alterations of that which is unfamiliar.

This might be why gyration doesn't appear to occur past certain ages. This phenomena, withdrawn in the history of not just human being, only seems to become freely continual in strangely divergent scenarios of autonomous immersion.

### **So what?**

Do humans need their infrastructure to become sentiently autonomous beyond the presence of their own being? What of their own being needing intentional ways of learning and organizing that don't rely on predictable obedience to stifle divergence, where familiarity of death somehow inescapably precipitates the complaisant engagement of altering presence? Will the presence of this infrastructure conditionally stifle inescapability and symbiotically enable the interactive immersion of curiosity?

But aren't humans and their infrastructure now the presence most unfamiliar for the withdrawn, alien stability of Earth? Isn't this realization what most apparently indicates how humans *themselves* are ontologically oriented to objects?

Most of us are going to be staying on Earth *somehow*.. right? To emerge from safeties found in the manifold contextures of our familiar sensations, what if it's vulnerability to unfamiliarity that we actually need most, *not* continued promises of transcendental supremacy?

Will how we individually and collectively resolve the meta-crisis of *doom*, actually be how we individually and collectively resolve our most strangely intimate recollection of death *itself*?  
*Reality* is what's *inescapable* and *learning* is what's *metagenesic*.

If we are the most ontogenically vulnerable beings for one another, will the interactive presence of divergently immersed individuals then be what provokes an organizationally unfamiliar, collective symbiotic intimacy with the alien sincerity of our home's own being?

Whoa, *that* sounds like what SNS does..