

Oscar Fernandez

# APHORISTIC COMPENDIUM

A tribute to Juan Magariños

*Oscar Fernandez*

# **Aphoristic Compendium**

**A tribute to Juan Magariños**

**2012**

*Dialogarts Publicações*

Copyright © 2010 Oscar Fernandez

Publicações Dialogarts (<http://www.dialogarts.uerj.br>)

Project Coordinator

Darclia Simões – [darciliasimoes@gmail.com](mailto:darciliasimoes@gmail.com)

Project Co-coordinator:

Flavio García - [flavgarc@gmail.com.br](mailto:flavgarc@gmail.com.br)

Publishing Coordinator:

Cláudio Cezar Henriques – [claudioc@bighost.com.br](mailto:claudioc@bighost.com.br)

Cover Project and Design:

Equipe Labsem - [labsem.uerj@gmail.com](mailto:labsem.uerj@gmail.com)

Dialogarts Logo:

Gisela Abad - [gisela.abad@gmail.com](mailto:gisela.abad@gmail.com)

Grammar Revision:

Barbara Tannuri Maluf

Simone Vieira Resende

Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro

Centro de Educação e Humanidades

Instituto de Letras

Departamento de Língua Portuguesa,

Literatura Portuguesa e Filologia Românica

UERJ – SR3 – DEPEXT –

Publicações Dialogarts-

2010

## CATALOG RECORD

F120 Aphoristic Compendium. Oscar Fernandez.

Translation: Barbara Tannuri, Maria Luisa S. Ramos e Simone Vieira – Rio de Janeiro: Dialogarts, 2010.

Publicações Dialogarts

Bibliography

ISBN: 978-85-8199-001-9

1. Semiotics. 2. Philosophy. 3. Science. 4. Biology. I. Fernandez, Oscar. II.

Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro. III. Departamento de Extensão. IV. Título

CDD 120.121

ISBN 978-85-8199-001-9



Contact:

UERJ/IL/LIPO – a/C Darcilia Simões ou Flavio García

Rua São Francisco Xavier, 524 sala 11.023 – B

Maracanã – Rio de Janeiro – CEP 20 569-900

[publicacoes.dialogarts@oi.com.br](mailto:publicacoes.dialogarts@oi.com.br)

[dialogarts@oi.com.br](mailto:dialogarts@oi.com.br)

[seminal@oi.com.br](mailto:seminal@oi.com.br)

## CONTENTS

0.	<i>Preliminary</i>	7
1.	<i>The Aphorism</i>	8
2.	<i>Language and body</i>	9
3.	<i>Living Being and Interaction</i>	11
4.	<i>Science, Technology and Consciousness</i>	15
5.	<i>Semiotics Interactions, Nature and Resemantization</i>	18
6.	<i>Synesthesia</i>	21
7.	<i>Aphorism and Poetry: A Metalinguistic approach</i>	24
8.	<i>Laughter and tears are not antagonic.</i>	34
9.	<i>Biosemiotoc and complexity</i>	36
10.	<i>Ecopolitics and complexity</i>	39
11.	<i>What is new in the new rationality?</i>	42
12.	<i>From ecological to meta-complex</i>	46
13.	<i>What do I believe in?</i>	54
14.	<i>Aforisms, Science and Art. The Pistemology of Desire</i>	57
15.	<i>Science, Ethic, Society</i>	66
16.	<i>Internet and its potentiality are a new paradigm.</i>	77
17.	<i>Transcomplex Aphorisms</i>	82
18.	<i>Bibliography</i>	87

*Sentences, maxims, sayings, adages, principles, rules, axioms, fragments, epigrams, oracles, aphorisms, in short, the many names for this minor and difficult genre, but one with a long background dating back to Hippocrates. Andrés Sánchez Pascual defined its three characteristics: didactic concision, critical agility and illustrated tendency.*

*(José Biedma López)*

## 0. PRELIMINARY

The philosophical biology is a study field that has a transdisciplinary tendency from which is possible to observe the emergence of new paradigms in biology, according to the worldviews of Fritjof Capra. Those paradigms have an influence on the cultural reality of humanity. From this perspective, the relationships between science & art, biopolitics & society, bioethics & education, science, ethics & society, among others, bring us closer to the complementarity view to a perspective that seeks to harmonize ideas and feelings once antagonistic (Cartesian-Newtonian Paradigm), in order to prove a complex and also dynamic configuration which permanently auto-generates and auto-organizes itself.

That way, the materials presented today are a discursive intent to and for showing the existing complex plot in these relationships, which turns the philosophical reflection into a multimorphic and polyvalent enterprise. This is the beginning of a new adventure. Welcome to the spirilic view of life. Welcome to life.

# 1. THE APHORISM

*“Not only is Aphorism a philosophical form, but also a wordplay and a poetic art, the complete expression, brief and relatively independent of a serious laugh, a grimace of a sincerely tragic spirit, like the one of a lunatic who knows what to say, or the one of a prudent man who recognizes the idiot within himself.”*

*(José Biedma López)*

The movement direction is determined by a voting class among the cells, the colony moves towards the direction elected by the majority” (Jesper Hoffmeyer and Claus Emmeche). Biosemiotics: the metaphor of life or the semiotics of nature. (The Biosemiotics Group).

Perception is a fundamental trait for the comprehension of signical-interpretive processes of matter organization as a whole; we should, therefore, be clear about the fact that those interpretations do, and always will, go through the human neuron system. Such interpretations will be drenched with emotions, beliefs and ideologies, though not openly expressed.

The search for regularities has absorbed most of the investigation time, while irregularities have usually been left out; this is something to be taken into account if, in fact, we wish to have a new science.



## 2. LANGUAGE AND BODY

Language is also a trap and theoretical biology has said little or nothing about it. The Umwelt (Subjective world, according to Uexküll) is both, integrative and diverging at the same time. The differences and the similarities between individual organisms and species are always present, and yet it still shows some harmonic patterns which allow the theoretical proximity.

The relationship Umwelt-organism feeds the world that creates them, turning this spirilic interaction (recursive/retroactive) into a sign-symbolic exchange which changes along with the subjective mind of his interpreter/ interpretant.

The basic meaning that, according to Uexküll, attributes each organism to the Umwelt, can be diversified to each one of the organisms, depending on the environmental conditions and whether it consists of an individual and /or collective relationship to be observed.

What is denominated by Uexküll as functional circle, I call functional spiral.

Actions or mental concepts, whatever came first? The body of each organism consists of a set of many universes interacting with one another.

The individual and/or collective subjectivity forms the way of the perception derived from the biosemiotic in the constitutive Umwelt of life.

We should learn with the Volvox democratic system (colonial multicellular organism). When do we lose the *Vo/voxic* sense of life?

Though it is true that biology has demonstrated that it is from the simple structures, such as bacteria (regarded as an evolutionary perspective) that we can study superior organisms through extrapolation; it is also true that such focus can't be taken linearly, and that the inter-level relations which may allow such extrapolation, should be taken into consideration.

Social movements are hipercycles (*hipercycle* is a concept introduced by Eigen e Schuster (1979), which shows us that every organism is the result of the cooperation among a variety of self-regulating autocatalytic systems).

A cancerous tumor is more than a conglomeration of cells that grows uncontrollably, according to Raskesh Jain; it is an organ that protects itself through a wall of tubes.

An organism is able to change the very world that creates it, co-creating itself with the rest of the surrounding organisms and with whatever co-exists with it symbiotically. Human being: an ecosystem of ecosystems.

### 3. LIVING BEING AND INTERACTION

*The living being is the instance for the required interaction;*

*There is no life outside cooperation; the rest is just neo Darwinian bias.*

*There has got to be a distinction between culture and civilization.*

*Culture is a set of beliefs and values pertaining to a community in particular. Civilization is what can be transmitted from one community to another:*

*techniques, knowledge, science, etc. For instance, the western civilization I refer to, which has also globalized itself, is the one defined by its scientific, technical and economical development set.*

*And it is this very civilization that, nowadays, has contributed with more negative than positive effects, that needs renovation, in other words, a civilization policy.*

*(Edgar Morin)*

*We must create articulated minds rather than divided ones, incapable of establishing the dialog between instrumental and content.*

*The former ones, underdeveloped.*

*(Emilio Roger Ciurana)*

The evident necessity of a shift in how to see and do politics in the world is most obvious; at the moment, the capitalist world is experiencing one of its worst crises, which also affects its values system. The competence, depredation, and the survival of the more capable ones are placed under suspicion whenever the latter can see the other side of the coin, especially in the so-called first world countries (a concept that needs to be revised, just as developed countries do too).

Unlikely many might believe, the symbiotic relations (mutualism and/or cooperation), are much more frequent in nature than in human skills. I am not trying to say that there are no skills, but that this western civilization has primarily privileged skill rather than cooperation, as one of the fundamental values.

Cooperation is viewed as a sign of weakness, or as a hesitant tool used to destroy the enemy (army, sports group). Under this perspective, the possibilities to conduct a change that enables us to see the potentials of others, not as a threat, but as an opportunity, are not, at this point, very close at hand as we wish it could be. That is the reason why the idea of a civilizing policy that unites rather than confront us, is more than necessary, it is imperative. The review of this form/structure passes through the review of former valid and immutable

values/beliefs; in such sense, a civilizing course is also an essentially ethical course.

Nothing new has been said so far, once the crisis of values has been discussed for some time now, and that is why the change needs to be profound; for instance, on one hand, we have been lectured about virtues, such as: respect among people, honesty, solidarity, etc.; however, in a tacit matter, they encourage us to compete, and that is when those supposed ideal virtues are significantly reversed by skills; this is when we may find individuals that are able to be more honest, respectable or supportive than others and, in the pursue of such need, are able to do whatever it takes to obtain it.

Therefore, that enables us to see how skills actually were, and still are, a mechanical essence of almost all human actions. They certainly play an important role in our evolution, but they are not, to my understanding, the most important ones. Skills are usually additives, of a nearly instinctive nature; I surprised myself, trying to walk faster than another person on the street, only for the pleasure of doing so. And that does not concern a matter of good or evil, but the possibility of observing and using it, from a much more aware than instinctive perspective. This all leads us to a paradox of our society, which is essentially

competitive, a paradox that consists of the obligation of being competitive or else, be outrun.

All of this is possible once we observe situations through a competitor's perspective. I might be meddling into a spiritual affair, which, by the way, is one often neglected by competitors, for it is considered unimportant; on the other hand, there are others who believe the spiritual consists of invoking a Deity (saint in Christianity) to win the confrontation or the conflagration; but those do no more than turn this competitive instance into a magical-religious belief that it is, curiously, contrary to the very same religious rules; for example: the wars in the name of God.

In this field, there is man and woman, god/goddess that as limited and egocentric beings, create deities in his image and likeness, and not the other way round.

*A path is just a path, and it is not shameful, neither for your own self, nor for others, to give it up, if your heart tells you so... Thoroughly observe each of them (read the paths). Put them to the test as many times as you think you should. Then, ask yourself, and nobody else: Is there a heart in this path? If it is such, it is a good path; if not, it is good for nothing. (Carlos Castañeda. The Teachings of Don Juan)*

The civilizing spin is not just a political one, but also a spiritual spin, and it is where the former trivial and superfluous demands a relevant concernment; we cruise up to the outer space of forgetfulness, where we rescue poetry, magic, beliefs, cooperation, mutual respect, complementarily, silence, and peace, not as metaphor but as part of a reality that pulsates with us in every step, in every breath. What we do or think should also go through this review, once it is proved that we are essentially contradictory beings; and we understand ourselves as such, when we believe the division of labor helps reinforce this condition. In western society, we find individuals that dedicate themselves to think for others and there are the ones who dedicate themselves to do for others; the division that seemed to be, at first, a functional cut, established itself in the human soul emphasizing an existential division of humanity.

#### **4. SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND CONSCIOUSNESS**

Science with consciousness, science or anti-science, subversive science, multi-science, trans-science, etc, are just some epithets that could go along with the title above, and that, out of respect for the readers,

were kept for the sake of the humble development of those ideas that aim originality.

We intended to gather some of them, which, throughout the history of mankind, allow us to present other possible scientific and technological perspectives for a better world, not only for humans, but also for all planetary existence.

We start off with the idea that our current science and technology (\* here treated as applied science), are originated from the necessity to know and learn what human species has and that, despite being one of the many other forms of knowledge, has been oriented for personalist purposes over the past 300 years, bringing our planet more problems than solutions. An all of this is due to the fact that the dominant paradigm of the twentieth and still the twenty-first century science is still the Cartesian-Newtonian one, which accounts for the fragmented, disciplinary and determinist view of science, therefore, in other words, an academic view.

Thereby, the social and natural sciences parted, the former subdividing in such way that the researches from a laboratory do not know what his next-door lab colleagues do, and even more pathetic, these do not know what their own co-workers do.



*This might sound rather unimportant for many, however, this is just a sample of the lonesome sense of the current science and of how dehumanized it is, in response to the blind, subjective faith, called by them as objectivity; objectivity that, according to Maturana, is nothing more than an imposing argument.*

*In such sense, this science and technique hold deeply influent ideological elements in everyday life, since it is a science that responds to countries needs, subjugating it to them and letting them decide for it, that it cannot be taken as a science with consciousness; on the contrary, it is a submissive science, a slave science.*

*As believed by Morin, today's world requires a strategist, someone with personal autonomy in his judgments, a problematic, innovative, creative person, who knows how to cross the danger, and who is able to relate information with knowledge, one who is tolerant and supportive.*

*(cited by Dr. Elba del Carmen Riera, in **La democracia cognitiva: una tarea pendiente**)*

**For Jacob von Uexküll, in his chapter *Indexical Signs*: nature (the world, the universe, the cosmos, the true reality, etc.) reveals itself through the processes of signs and semiotics.**

*The term semi sphere incorporated in this theory indicates a level of ontological occurrence of the sign, instead of only an epistemological perspective for its description.*

*It is the varied world of communication:*

*Sounds, smells, movements, colors, electrical fields, chemical signals, touch, all of them are meaningful to the phenomenon of life. (Estela Santilli)*

*While information, as understood by the physicists, has no connections with values, purposes, or transcendence, the biologists' notion of it is close to the current language and it really plays a role in the system, at least when it comes to promoting survival. (Hoffmeyer)*

## **5. SEMIOTICS INTERACTIONS, NATURE AND RESEMANTIZATION**

In accordance with Hoffmeyer, cited by Santilli, one can find all levels of complexity in the processes of intelligent semiotic interactions, whereas the games are selected, not the players. Biomedics, bionics, biometrics and bioengineering, they all belong to the same 'cyberg' logic.

A resemantized nature could explain the meaning of mimicry, mimetic and bioengineering. However, I believe that nature is partially resemantizable.

A hypothetical experiment will help us understand the meaning, sometimes a bit absurd, of today's science: Let us imagine that a scientist

calls himself a microbiologist; yet, this title sounds generic, and therefore, he specializes, for instance, in viruses; as there are two major types of viruses, he must decide between 'adenovirus' and 'arnvirus' , also called retrovirus; If he chooses the former, he might turn to a bibliography of microbiology approach, but if he chooses the latter, this same bibliography might become totally useless.

The mutability of retrovirus does not help predict, through a deterministic reductionistic logic, the processes generated there. The non-linearity is contrary to fragmentation.

We shall discuss about the meaning of the terms mechanism and process. I assume those are very different concepts, but if the standards for usage (as the linguistics say) have made them synonyms, we might as well think of other alternative terms.

The simplicity as it is understood through fragmentation is also suspicious; the paradigm of complexity teaches us that there is complexity in the simple and vice versa. We should only learn how to perceive it.

We have just begun to study the interactions derived from the oscillations between the living beings

and the cosmos, which are the basis for the establishment of cosmobiosemiotics as field of knowledge.

We should study the interactions resulted from the semiosphere and cosmosphere (new relational multiverse).

The classical genetics and physiology approximate concepts present in the midst of individual molecular codes. However, we must build bridges between individual and collective institutions that acquire new meanings and senses of coexistence, when going from a singular to a plural condition.

The biotelematic and biorobotics refer to the Cyborg code. The physiological and ontological do not always go together. What other codes, besides the genetic, can be found in nature? Do animals' paths follow clear routes?

Hoffmeyer (1996) used the metaphor of the swarming body.

*Reality does not become objective even if it is shared. If I see a flying saucer in the sky, it becomes a part of my individual subjective reality. If I share this information with my neighbors and they also see the saucer, then it becomes a part of our shared subjective reality. There may be subjectivity at any level of the hierarchy: cells, individuals, families, nations, and even humanity as a whole.*

*(Alexei Sharov)*

*Is it possible to find intentionality in the process of natural selection?*

*(Alexei Sharov)*

*Perception requires information transfer. A photoreceptor sends an electric impulse to the brain. It is important that the brain recognizes impulses from individual photoreceptors. If nerve fibers become entangled, then the brain cannot associate an incoming impulse with a specific receptor, and the information is lost.*

*(Alexei Sharov)*

## **6. SYNESTHESIA**

Apparently, Synesthesia is not a phenomena studied by Sharov. A synesthetic one confuses the senses perception; he sees the sounds, feels the tastes, etc. He is a neurological poet. Can the synesthetic perception help in understanding the biosemiotic nature through a poetic perspective?

What would be the contributions of neopoetry and neurosemiotics in a complex perspective?

*Watching everything from a non- predetermined place ( in 'batesian' terms ) is the same as looking at everything from as many places as possible. (Guido Lagos Garay)*

*What is the pattern that connects the crab to the lobster and the orchid to the primrose, and all four of them to me? And me to you? And all the six of us to the amoeba in one direction and to the back-ward schizophrenic in another?" (Gregory Bateson)*

*What is the pattern which connects all the living creatures?  
(Gregory Bateson)*

### **Illustrating:**

**A mother rewards her son with ice cream every time he eats his spinach: Which additional information do you need in order to determine that within time-son?**

1. Will hate or love spinach?
2. Will hate or love ice-cream?
3. Will hate or love his mother?

**"The wizard creates and opens contexts."**

### **Michael Lowy said:**

*When it comes to ecology and socialism, the first thing to consider is – to what extent the capitalist ratio is taking our little planet and its living inhabitants to a catastrophic situation, from an environmental perspective, of the survival conditions of human life and life in general.*

*Bioestetica must see itself as a high transverse term presenting other logic for knowledge/power from which one can give a multi-referential to life.*

*Community Symbiosis, required encounter.*

*Each community is a different body, and each one may and have to become a huge body of blood, mind and spirit.*

*The scientific community has to be attentive to speak of another country.*

The nature of nature lives in each of us, we are nothing alone, but neither are we if we do not know the distances between the micro and the macro cosmos that we carry within us and how they interrelate.

*"Mimetic is the study of ideas and concepts seen as living organisms or brain viruses that are able to reproduce and to develop in the ideosfera." (Carlos von der Becke)*

According to an ideological view, publicity and advertisement is the engine of mimetic.

## **7. APHORISM AND POETRY: A METALINGUISTIC APPROACH**

*Karma is the eternal assertion of the free will..." our thoughts, our words and our deeds are the net we throw around ourselves". (Swami Vivekananda)*

We observe in the ecology of senses that the dialog between aphorisms and poetry (reason and feeling) are not only possible but necessary, since we were build on a logical base that opposes us against nature and classify us. Therefore, we think scientists do not show their feelings because that takes away the objectivity, and in its turn, poets do not rationalize because that takes away the beauty. Thereby, we set apart. We separate ourselves in small portions which we call discipline.

Today, through the ecology of the senses, we are offered the possibility of joining, comparing and/or complementing the feeling/thinking, because definitely our mind and heart are not independent, on the contrary, we are them both in harmony (and much more)

In the Universe of possibilities, a human being with no destination will find in the word a straightforward accomplice that makes his acting a bit more tolerable. Interest in writing, particularly poetry, is timeless; actually, I believe that it appears to me like breathing, but it is automatic as well. It could be a desperate attempt to return to the womb, but it no longer works, something has to die and to militate somewhere. If, in the end, this experience suits something, should be at least a beautiful epitaph or a meeting of loneliness that still think that the upper and low sea can meet in a glance or in a song of a siren.



1. There is a gap between the written and the spoken word that distinguish the thinking from the not thinking.
2. The inter punctuality is expressed in a settled way when it intends to express itself, since explanation is the sign of reason (a unique thought).
3. The meaning and the significance go into a drawer with no way out when it comes to distinguishing what is consistent and what is not.
4. I come up with the problem of our language. If we focus on the signs, we will end up biting our own tail: if we say goodbye to dictionaries, to concepts, to the theories, to the hypotheses, to theoretical, what will it be left for us, say goodbye to the language?
5. Aphorisms, poetry and image constitute a unit that sometimes becomes independent at each step, gathering instantly a distinct and changeable idea. It could be a desperate ideo-grammar attempt; but what is more interesting is not only to admit a coexistence that is harmonic or inharmonic, continuous and discontinuous, in order or chaotic, singular or plural, but also to accept with no anguish to join new ones. Definitely, it is worth not thinking but dreaming or to thinking while dreaming.
6. Multidimensional reconstructions mean (suspiciously) bold intentions to pull out stars(or not)

7. Immobility alone does not mean simplicity but presents a point of view (maybe the poorest).
8. Total complexity sounds like total simplicity, both suggest being reinterpreted, reinvented, dressed or undressed throughout life.
9. Discontinuity of life is stunning, and interpreting it frustrates or holds it at least.
10. The Search for linearity presupposes desperate attempts to present “constructos” whose inconsistencies are not yet demonstrated . ( The dialectic game)
11. Words transtorn irreversible conditions.
12. If a word is limited, its interpretation and its study are limited as well.
13. Speaking, writing and reading mean three sub worlds connected with large interstices that cannot be infinite, but plural and heterogeneous.
14. Are the semiotic methods mechanistic?
15. Which are the semiotic methods?
16. Literature, an intercultural place with multidimensional conditions.
17. Literature is able to surpass a complex thought, but it does not define itself as such.

18. Every word is ambiguous and can be treated in relative terms as the truth: the truth that is, sometimes, a lie.
19. Every word is a social product and it is real despite being social.
20. Word makes a plural voice but not always
21. Reading assumes interpretation that, sometimes, can be individualized or collective: the thought is internal, however the real thinking denotes a special way of reorganization that will always be mediated by a reason shaped according to the needs of the thinker. All this does not mean that the thought is linear.
22. Speech is not reasoning.
23. Does audio-visual language require a particular kind of literacy?
24. For Wittgenstein, originality does not exist; "The word is not the owner".
25. Word- anatomy of images.
26. Singing distinguishes itself from the speech because sonority has no limits.
27. Music is a universal language par excellence.
28. When the word becomes an object, it requires a potential feeling that creates dependency.

29. The dualism “production-interpretation” defines a play of signs, reducing all the speech to the significant order.
30. Silence hypertexts the language.

The inability to communicate can be an anticipation of a new language. A dialogical model is necessary to combat the lack of communication. We explain the world through what is explained to us.

Interpretation changes according to cognitive-environmental interactions created in each man to give, definitely, a small approach to something that many call reality. It is necessary to learn how to see with closed eyes. It is necessary to learn about the hugeness of the mountains through a grain of sand. There is no justification that can justify itself.

The illusion to create truth that guides our ideas, relativizes the thinking and sets it to signal universes limited by some codes and a language.

Symbolic and cultural associations not always mean what they pretend to be. A real symbol means aspect in other culture. Is advertising a symbolic reflection of a historical and cultural reality? Is Graffiti a particular type of advertising that reflects the peaceful faces of nameless labels?

The exercise of interpretation requires a continuous upgrading of the object of study or a continuous recreation of what already exists. The sequence of the speech, with no segmentation, assures the reading of the text by the general public. Dominant speech determines the meanings but not its interpretation.

According to Raiter, potential meaning created through the speech defines "a particular and ideological display that regulates the movement of possible meanings. They act as a limit and the opening of possible meanings that can be accomplished from text stimuli".

Poetry exists, however it is not said. The means is the message. (McLuhan)

Meaning depends on the means which in turn, is the message. The Contents of a message precede the production of new ones. Contents and messages are energy. Messages are not created or destroyed; they transform themselves; the law of the conservation of the message. Content of a message is the message of other content. The very moment that the simultaneous overcome the sequential we enter the total universe.

*The interpretation is mediated by multiple factors that approaches to each other but do not meet. "Comprehension defines action". (Nietzsche)*

Film contents can be originated from one or several messages and its presentation can be homogeneous or heterogeneous; it all depends on the director. Social-culture minority reflects heterogeneous conditions to interpret and assume the common state of things.

The meanings define the social agreements allowing the communicability. They belong to a moral point of view that is not necessarily static. Silence is the symbol of wisdom.

There are those who write to communicate, there are those who write to themselves. Speech seldom expresses the thought. There is a great epistemological separation between thought and speech. There is a greater immediacy between thought and writing than between thought and speech. Respect silence suggests respect thinking. Reading does not apply to decoding grammar signs only. Thinking suggests a mental effort that deserves to be done, writing and speech requires it as well. He who writes poetry bares his soul. He who reads poetry, reads bared souls. The wisdom of the wise man comes from life; the wisdom of the scholar comes from information. They are and are not comparable. It all depends on the one who compares.

Could a man be a scholar and at the same time still be wise? Comprehension and tolerance are

indicative symbols of good communication. The image in the poetic-sign symbiosis is put into context by virtual traces. The oblique view century converts into lights of cyber space. The body scans in bifurcations of thoughts. The nonlinear crossing of creative complexity shades holistic turbulence. Critical and visual Poetry converges on the same mass-media experience.

The lingual-ideographic company recommends a new pos-individual state. The subtle forgets the rhetoric to say much more. The iconographic poetry suggests events. The social discourse is the discourse of the prohibition. The power and the desire practice an important influence on social discourse manifestation. The madman's word should be heard with more attention. The opposition reason X madness is an exclusion principle, according to Foucault.

Nameless things still exist. Non appointed things are above words. Man lives in a monotonous way justifying the unjustifiable. Are there meaningless words? The magician and the religious interconnect to tell us about complexity. A balanced flow seems to be the synonym of energy and health. It seems that the human being and the crystal, the human being and the smoke, the human being and vegetal, the human being and itself are complementary. Man and its nature gravitate

between the crystal and the clouds. Our conceptual deductions are nothing more than examples of point of view. Anthropocentrism and geocentric, for example.

Every conceptualization and / or definition is nothing more than an approach. For example: the variants of a man conceit tell us that he is a biosocial, and then say that he is a biopsicosociospiritual. What will they tell us later? The unidirectional nature of our vision led us believe that what we observed and appointed was just that, now we believe that we are also appointed. We believe now that we are more than the amount of parts; tomorrow, that we never had those parts. Sin, guilt and forgiveness are not ecological. Fashion and fanaticism are mixed up with the ecological. Maybe it is part of the ecological dynamics of the population.

We used to see the world in black and white, however, today we start seeing it colorful and we believe that we know it in total. But we still need to know its texture, scent and flavor.

The universe is not order or disorder; it is both. How will an ecological discipline act? For example: ants. Our population dynamics is different from other species and different from the universe structures in which we are reasoning beings.



Reason is logic and logic is not ecological. We should learn the population dynamics of our cells and molecules. If it is right that the human being is more than instinctive, it is also right that being such does not mean that we do not have instinct.

## **8. LAUGHTER AND TEARS ARE NOT ANTAGONIC.**

Some say that architecture is anti-ecological because it modifies the environment, but we should remember that environment and man are part of the same nature. For this reason, architecture is ecological allowing a harmonious inter-relation with the environment affecting it as little as possible.

Ecology is science and anti-science as well. Therefore, the ecological thinking is and is not logical. In the cultural artistic, the harmonic systems define the ecological function of things. Spontaneous and induced creation present eco-evolutionary conditions that define a state of adaptation.

Creation does not exist from an evolutionary perspective. According to Wittgstein "Originality does not exist", only innovation. Creation exists according to an experimental perspective of each one according to a relativist perspective.

So it creates and/or invents realities even if they already exist. Our acts and thoughts impact nature in different ways, ranging from a physical and psychological operation of the objects (subjects that are their own objects) to modification of metaphysics order that trespass the logical understanding of how things work.

Nowadays, we return to Guayuco searching for answers that we cannot find in the microscope. Climate nature is different from human nature; climate gives and takes life in the same way; that is why it is hard to understand it. Nature's moral is not the same as man's moral

The air becomes purer the less human we are. Ecological love is similar to "to want and to hate" related to a wavering mood and a dynamic exchange.

Red is red while green is yellow. Changes are not always what we expect. Because of his cultural nature, man needs to believe in something and/or in someone; for this reason, an ecological religion would represent an intercultural integration and, maybe, a cognitive

and spiritual representation of a real human being; but since the truth does not exist, it would be a desperate attempt to regulate diversity.

We are more than we think we are and less than we want to be. If perception is plural, ecology is plural as well; ecology is more tolerance than singularity.

How to think ecologically without being Aristotelian, or how to think in an Aristotelian ecological way?

How to take hold of the resources that nature gives us and the ones we create ourselves without being hurt or affected physically or psychologically by them?

An ecological law will never be so since it is man who creates the laws. This is the reason why they place the Homo sapiens above other creatures in nature. We always talk about a false equilibrium.

We do not know if talking about ecological is talking about perfection, since perfection represents order to many people and in many aspects of the nature the ecological can and can not be order at the same time.

In the multiverse (multiuniverse) of eco-evolutionary relations, the total (meaning equality and/ equilibrium) will always be partial.

The union of opposites does not necessarily represent the complexity.

## 9. BIOSEMIOTIC AND COMPLEXITY

From virus to whales, from micro-fungus to trees: we all have something to say. The only advantage of being a primate is that we still recognize ourselves in the mirror. We should all attend a business school for ants. Let us observe the transmutation of the caterpillar.

Which tiger cut its nails? Which plant hates carbon dioxide? It is curious the fractality of a sunflower. A glass of snow is order and chaos at the same time. Horses know each other through their eyes. Parrots do not just repeat words. Message is the means in natural semiotic. Between the heart and the reason there is an entire immune system. How complex can the thought web be (organization, structure)!

If it is not heard it does not mean that it was not said. For example: the sound of the bats and the dolphins. Let yourself be touched by the smart tentacles of an octopus. We could learn a lot with migratory birds and with magnetic fields

The relation tide/moon tells us about gravity law. And what does the relation living being /moon tell

us about? Usually we are not aware of all we say. For example: the blindness of light-emitting fish (they do not know what they see or what they do).

How punctual the birds are. And they do not have clocks. Or do they? Let us synchronize our biologic clocks with the birds. Dogs can smell cancer; can you do the same?

If a plant listen to a rock'n roll it dries out ; what happen to the human beings listening to the same music?

If we heard the voice of elephants, we could understand life better. If we listened to elephants, we would remember their complex language, and to them, their memory is better than ours.

There is no politics or protocol in the social order of bees. Let us sing the rain with the song of cicadas. I prefer the seismic predictions of the animals to the seismographs and the seismologists.

Farmers know when it is time to sow. Urban man do not know when it is time to live. Farmers understand quite well the signs of nature. Indians do not only speak to their gods. No animal species need to contrive games to share it in a mediocre way (except humans).

Associations, groups, religions, teams etc. are just human inventions; the rest of the zoological species do not requires excuses for sharing.

Water is not only the origin of life. It is also its vehicle. If God were a living creature on earth, I believe He would not be a human being again.

## **10. ECOPOLITICS AND COMPLEXITY**

*It is necessary to break the barrier between you and me, the past and the future, the observer and the observed, because everything happens right now and in all. To harmonize differences is to turn all minds in one, and this would improve the humankind, save the world, I mean, this would be the real revolution. (Facundo Cabral)*

On very few occasions politics has been ecological or vice-versa. There is a lack of recognition of both for its collectivity to be recognized as a unit. Political complexity emerges when we recognize that its multifactorial nature comes from public opinion. Public opinion seems to be static and immutable when there is a predominance of an opinion over others, but when it is divided, a new dynamic requires another ecological logic.

A new logic (dynamic-global) is not order or chaos; both are searching for harmony. A static world is quite impossible. If one conceives the equilibrium as something paralyzed we are in the greatest of all mistakes.

Liberty, justice, democracy and equality are ideas that regulate themselves in society. Therefore, excessive liberty, justice, democracy and equality become the worst prison to others. New rationality is to give way to old paradigms that have always existed, but remained recessive by natural selection of public opinion.

Cosmvision absence of action is action as well (potential action). Lack of transdisciplinary vision becomes unemployment. New rationality is old for some and unacceptable for others. New would not be to accept "the new", but do not reject the plan of the old.

*The current world needs a different rationality, marked by cooperation, sense of responsibility, the ability to relate some things and the phenomena to others, and so find out the emerging sprouts of the new in every moment. (Sérgio Vilar)*

Is there a chance that what is pointed out by Vilar ever existed? What is new to Vilar? I believe that a new age will not be for teamwork as many believe, but for tolerance.

What happens to those who work alone and feel fine? Will it be a sin to work alone in a new era? Will it be the first commandment of a new techno-scientific religion? What would the other nine be? How simple is the simple knowledge?

In a society as simplifying as ours, generalist writers with disciplinary tendency are driven to the corners of knowledge and, in many cases, are seen as curious objects of admiration.

Generalist writers are Nobel Prize or doctors in something. They are multifaceted subject, encyclopedists, phenomena, crossword solvers, etc. But they are those who always hear: what is your specialty? What do you do?

Culturally, it is asked to the generalists: What are you doing here since it is not your field? Which is the field of a generalist? The curious thing about this is that, in many parts, promoters of a new rationality are super conservative beings. Is new rationality a fashion in some academic spaces?

If you take Nobel prizes as an example of new rationality, you see that they got their prize, in many cases, working within the rationality. Is the old rationality what nominates Nobel prizes?



Then which “generalism” defends a Physical Nobel prize that studies physics and does not defend literature or other distinct communication discipline? Shouldn’t we search for new thinkers in non-disciplinary spaces? How plural and generalist is the thought of someone that works in a public area, a single field? Will new rationality be criticized by the academy and goes on working with the same tools?

From a Godelian point of view it is impossible to know it ( the scientific thought), therefore will be a lack of information about a given phenomenon, leaving our conclusions incomplete.

By the way, all that we know do not derive from the same incompleteness? Would not knowledge be an interpretation of reality? Would not knowledge be a collective agreement of this interpretation? Would not all interpretation be a cognitive- process? Would not all interpretation be a partially phenomenon?

## **11. WHAT IS NEW IN THE NEW RATIONALITY?**

What impacts us on this new rationality is not the rationality itself but the domain the defenders exert on the public opinion. Was Leonard da Vinci

a transdisciplinary man? What is the very new of new transdisciplinary? Would it be; to search for this rationality in non-academic areas?

To recognize transdisciplinary nature in everyone and everything? That all this issues could be shared for everyone, not only by the Nobel prizes.

To consider and to enjoy transdisciplinary nature in all kinds of arts, mainly the visual arts (cinema, TV, etc). To recognize it not as new, but that it has not been the dominant rationality in the past. To enjoy knowledge from other non-scientific areas such as Indians, popular, magic-religious, artistic and the one from other distinct European/western cultures.

It is logical that academics see old non-dominant ideas as new; it is negative that they are the ones who ask for changes. What change? Where are those who have always been the generalists? To be transdisciplinary would be to see the simple in the complex and to see the complex in the simple all the time.

A teacher that fosters transdisciplinary although he is not one of them would be the one that, facing a given problem, does not demand their students to find a unique method to solve it.

If God is transdisciplinary, why some say that transdisciplinary is new? Diversity in thinking is always there, even when “discovers of new rationality” have not seen them.

Nature is what it is; not what we want it to be. From the multiple and complete perspective, trivial is complex and complex is trivial. Everything matters. Nothing matters. Who said the blue I see is the same blue you see?

Senses promotes tastes, from there comes preferences, for example, the red color but not the green one ( the sense of sight) going further: Which sensation motivates these tastes? Are these motivations the same and do they have the same intensity in each one of us? We do not have to consult neurophysiological and neurochemical studies for the answer that we are different from the quality of our perception. That is why we are different in our interpretations and in our interests as well.

We are equal in culture and in the cultural homogenization induced by the masses, but we are infinitely different in essence and in our genes. So, how do we realize the same one? Because we believe it is so. Because we have conditioned ourselves since we were small children to maintain the same dominant discourse,

the one from school. So: one who realizes in a different way is; a madman ,a super gifted; Or simply someone whose experiences and/or motivations led him through different ways ordinarily accepted.

What was said earlier is the same to a child that composes a symphony at five (like Mozart) or to a serial killer. It is for sure that ethically they acquire different values; cultural and socially they receive quite similar stimuli.

We will be fair (or fairness is achieved) when recognizing that we are ruled by our limited perception. How to teach to observe the world from a multipurpose point of view at school? It is curious that every child is essentially multipurpose. In this case the question would be: how to learn to be multipurpose as a child? What make us infinite is to recognize ourselves as limited beings (from the perceptive point of view).

Within each limited macro areas there are infinite micro relation areas. The impossibility to know it through our own means and to recognize the interpretative plurality in others become an infinite perception when we start to correlate the already known learning as individual. On the other hand, when these correlations are integrated in other sets the infinite becomes finite.

*Only totality leads to clarity. (Schiller)*

*The social whole is not a reunion of previous elements or a new entity, but a related system; each one generates, while a mere relation, a transformation that reconnects the terms. (Piaget)*

*The idea of wholeness expresses itself prettier and richer when it is not totalitarian, when it is unable to close on itself, when it becomes complex : it shines more in the polycentrism of its relatively independent parts than in the wholeness of the globalism. (Edgar Morin)*

Infinite is everything that goes beyond our limits. The universe is infinite, and yet it has limits: the expiration date.

Will a theoretical work that attempts to join the semiotics theories to the biotechnological one be an example of everything that was said before?

Will the reunion of ecological, cognitive, semiotic, neuron-scientific and complex theories in the same axiomatically work be a transdisciplinarity example of a meta-theoretical work<sup>1</sup>? Will cyber/culture be an example that brings light to a new cybernetic culture<sup>2</sup>? Or will it be a work that relates bioethics to society<sup>3</sup>?

---

1 <http://www.accionchilena.cl/Ecofilosofia/deloecolocoalometacomplejo.htm>

2 <http://www.ucm.es/info/nomadas/7/ofdez2.htm>

3 <http://www.bioetica.org/colab16.htm>

## 12. FROM ECOLOGICAL TO META-COMPLEX

Ecology is poetry made of flower. Ecological thinking is to find out that we are not alone. Eco-politics is in essence an anti-capitalist tendency. In this world, "Ying" and "Yang" means industrial-technical development versus ecological development that needs to balance with the biosphere.

A man needs to loosen up more and more his way to discover himself in order to understand why coexistence is necessary. Heterogeneity is ecological diversity. Respect for difference is respect for life. We are on the way to build a new ethical-political life, by life and to life.

Ecology is resistance. Ecology is disorder and it is order, it is chaos and self-organization. Is neither one nor the other, is both in harmony. Harmony is the same nature music. That is why music is ecology. Freedom is not taught; it is inherited by cultural consanguinity.

The general and the particular transform the inductive in a deductive experience; actually, it goes beyond reductionism or generalization. The man makes computer, and computer makes man.

Complementarity allows us to find levels of competition and harmony in places where such encounter

seemed unreachable. Pascal: "The heart has reasons that reason does not understand". The mass media are openly showing their status as political parties.

*"It is not hard to teach man the truth. It is hard to remove the lie out of him". ( Emilio López Medina )*

Lie has become the truth to man; and the truth is a strange visitor.

Fear is the father of lies.

When someone says: do not say such a thing to bother the "X" person, actually he said so to avoid his own pain.

The great fear is caused by suffering; but it is quite like the death, inevitable.

Death and suffering should be seen as normal, for they are part of the everyday life.

The everyday life is not always what we desire. But desire is the irrefutable reason of so much pain and joy.

Desire boosts a man's life. A man without desire is an object.

Science and its methodology do not, by themselves, guarantee the protection of the environment.

Technical arguments and the statistical tables are not enough to compensate the degree of the uncertainties caused by the environmental impact studies.

Citizen participation and the rescue of the intuition are needed for the techno-scientific logic, seeking as Maturana said: " Arguments to oblige".

According to Edgar Morin, the three principles of complex thinking are:

1. Dialogic principle: it is based on the complex association (complementary, competing, antagonistic) of necessary instances to the existence , operation and development of an organized phenomenon.
2. Recursive principle: every moment is, in turn, producer and product, causing and causer; so the product is the producer who produces, the causer effect of the causing.
3. Holographic principle: not only the part is in the whole, but the whole is somehow in the part.

Complexity becomes a hyper-complexity when there are new paradigms, such as the ecological, the cyber, the neurological and the semiotic, randomly interacting with each other and with the complex thought. They create a post-contemporary philosophy and, as a consequence, a new culture or subculture.



## **I distinguish three principles in a cyber thought:**

1. Principle of the space-time discontinuity: classical notion of space and time are reconfigured here, here and now, there and after get confused in a quantum state. At the same time, we are without being, we exist without exist and all is to blame the internet.
2. Principle of multidimensional sensory: in virtual reality with different applications in simulators, theme parks, etc., the main purpose is to confound the senses and in consequence, create a parallel dimension making the real unreal and the unreal real, at least for a while
3. Principle of virtual reality: the virtual exists in distinct time and space condition, however tangible and measurable. We feel, we see, we look at, etc.; in consequence it produces stimuli and generates answers. We plan the advent of a new logic: the virtual logic that will tell us about a virtual truth, about a virtual life.

## **I observe in an ecological thought the following principles:**

1. Homoestatic principle: it refers to the continuous dynamic equilibrium that remains from the molecular to the systemic level in all living beings allowing them to perform their duties preserving a structure. It suggests also a new way of

thinking the order, and in consequence, our lives.

2. Cooperation and competence principle: According to Darwin's natural selection, the living beings compete in order to survive; but it is sure that they cooperate with each other; the second phenomenon is more frequent than the first one. It allows us to find ideas to compete with others and are able to control them for different reasons, such as:

- Argumentative Superiority;
- Historical correspondence;
- Empirical evidence etc.

We could rescue some elements, even all the ideas, if we could analyze them under different logic. Cooperation as well would be more efficient if we could transcend all the barriers and see us as private creators, more co-participle of a collective intellectual that, in turn, give up its merits, but recognizes in the collective the possibility of creating more and faster. In view of our limited body condition, or the fact that we can learn everything by ourselves, intersubjective collaboration becomes an opportunity to break our paradigms.

1. Self-organization principle: There are discoveries that are inviting biologists to exchange their approaches.

The living beings are high order systems. They have complicated structures that maintain and yet double itself through a very precise ballet of chemicals and behavioral activities. Since Darwin, biologists consider that natural selection is the only source of that order. " But Darwin could not have suspected the self-organization of a recent and innate discovery of some complex systems". (Stuart A. Kauffman, Antichaos and Adaptation, scientific American, August 1919, p.64).

**The processes that lead to new ideas are not clearly established in our thoughts; however, they often appear as phenomena of uncertain origin, and in some way they seek for self-organization.**

*Human neocortex is a prodigious anarchic tissue from randomly synaptic joints. Composed of specialized cells (neurons), the mind is a non specialized field where several sites are installed and through them lateral interaction is carried out. Anarchic interactions are the source of the central order... There is no equilibrium but instability, permanent tension among these aspects that are basically complementary resulting easily as competing and antagonistic .( Edgar Morin)*

*The brain is the most complex material we know in the universe, and it shows a great variability among individuals.( Edelman)*

2. In the neuroscientific thought I observe some principles or

multidimensional condition of different relations that goes beyond the human understanding given their multiple and sometimes simultaneous relational interconnections. The only possible way (so far) to approach to the understanding of this dynamic is the computer simulation. With the help of supercomputers it can randomly match an infinity of interconnections. Without this help it would be virtually be impossible to understand the nature of this neurocybernetic phenomenon.

3. Neuroenergetic principle: We just began to know the complex universe of genes and with them the neurosciences open more space to the incomprehension that sometimes seemed unlimited. However, there seemed to be evidence of the possibility of certain behaviors that might be influenced by explosive genes.
4. So, whatever the future of this idea, it offers at this very moment a door that cannot fail to open, even though it does not seem clear, because a new philosophy can arise.
5. Neurolinguistic program principle: The neurolinguistic program is expressed as a behavior model guided through behaviorist and psychoanalytic aspects to change the unfavorable interpretations generated through the five senses. They require a new approach to be overcome. In this sense, this model has showed an apparent success

- that goes from psychological therapy (depression, stress, schizophrenia), through methods used in business to the development of applied techniques in teaching and learning
6. (learning to learn). It can be considered a high point in behaviorism that can lead us to total alienation (subliminal messages) or to total liberation. Anyway, this principle is used as an important connection between what is known and the expert. Even though we lack a lot to understand the functioning of the nervous system (a partial way, not total). This can be an interesting interface element between us and our ideas.

## **13. WHAT DO I BELIEVE IN?**

First, and above all, I believe in God.

I believe in multiple realities, I do not believe in a unique thought.

I believe that all thought is affected by experience, so we speak not just from empirical evidence, but from intimate experience. And that's why several people facing the same phenomenon in a distinct way can reach the same result.

I believe in the finitude of the human body ( in such a way that will always be something else to say,

and some reading to be done).

I believe in theory as an approach to understand things, not the thing as itself.

I believe in objectivity because all thought flows through the interpretation filter and it, on the other hand, flows through cultural filter (habits, values, tradition, fears, joys, etc).

I believe in polyvalent logic (widespread logic) beyond the binary, radial, Aristotelian logic of zero and ones, yes and no, good, bad, beautiful, ugly etc.; ultimately, I believe that there are empty spaces waiting to be fulfilled.

I believe in complementarity as methodology that- unlike others- searches connection points among opposing ideas, apparently antagonics.

I believe in scientific method as an instrument among many others that can be simultaneously used.

I believe in Descartes methodic doubt to the point that I doubt his own method.

I believe science has left out many exception to the rules that have to be considered nowadays.

I believe that nature mathematics is the complex mathematic: nonparametric statistic, chaos theory,

uncertainty principle, mechanic fractal statistics : non linear sciences.

I believe in uncertainty and in indetermination as key elements to technical-scientific advances.

I do not believe in radicalism, I believe in its absence in harmonious coexistence.

I believe that capitalism is the ultimate expression of positivism and I believe that it is coming to an end.

I do not know that a new system will come, but I know that the world requires a reorganization and I do not believe in the option "ultra" side by side, but the "inter". As I said before, it has been unexplored.

I believe that everything has to do with everything.

I believe that the whole can be more or less the sum of its parts

I believe that a solitary cell is not a cell.

I believe that both substance and form, reductionism and generalism deserve to find its point or/ the point of meeting.

I believe I can work on this new perspective.

I believe in order and disorder, in homeostasis,

plants totipotentiality, in self-regulation, in self-organization, in symbiosis, in biogeochemical cycles, in feedback, in climate, in fractals, in time reaction, etc.,; all those phenomena that from a reductionist/ generalist perspective remain unconcluded.

I believe in social phenomema as a complex interconnected dynamic, because I believe in the analysis of social system in terms of network.

I believe in neural network:

*In 1943, the neuroscientist Warren McCulloch and the mathematician Walter Pitts published a pioneer work: a logical calculus of ideas immanent in nervous activity. They showed that the logical process from any behavior can be transformed into rules for building a network. (Fritjof Capra)*

## **14. AFORISMS, SCIENCE AND ART. THE PISTEMOLOGY OF DESIRE**

The change that promotes difference is endless.

Confidence is a lie as much as truth and reality are.

Complementary is a possibility between strength and consciousness in dialogic relations.



Contradiction soothes the distance between thought and reason.

The fundamental principles of life may not be written on a paper since its paths are always partial.

What is mutually excluding finds unlimited and vague possibilities that soon converge into dialogic relations. Life agreements.

The whole is the sum of the parts. Is it more or less the complete sum of the parts of the same system?

It is the whole and intense explanation of reality. Could it be its own fiction?

To what extend what we call fiction is as real or more ? Is virtual reality real or not? How real is a dream? How real is a thought?

What is objectivity? Maturama said: " objectivity is an argument to oblige", but even his own argument is so. It is the same .

What is the distance between what we call real objectivity e what we curiously call "loema"

Is truth like hunger, does it exist or is it necessary?

Are plurality, discontinuity, 'aclatoridad', complementarity, relativity, complexity, etc, inventions of a new science?

Are we inventing a new science or are we re-semanticizing it ? are we creators or make- up artists?

Do we go on making science and therefore religion?

*Inside the quantitative existence, contradiction, confusion and chaos represent the counterpart ( in which turn is the same) of balance, energy and stability that makes complementarity an alternative way of continuity. " Atoms search for pleasure and pain" ( Frederico Nietzsche)*

Sometimes, nature drawings lack the portrait of God.

Babich says that to Nietzsche, "world is appearance", the world perception-interpretation is motivated by the need to believe that all this is called science, truth; that reality exists.

Knowledge is assisted by the aesthetics of existence.

A philosophy of science that touches art and live from it is more than philosophy, it is more than science.

I do not want to believe in my experience, it just uses me.

Believing for believing is religion, to believe based on one or several reasons, that is religion to science.

Science is, in many cases, a logical and linear belief.

I doubt the doubt, I doubt the reason, I doubt the belief, I doubt myself.

All thinking is strange to the thought, every substance is strange to itself.

I am unaware of the retina of God, therefore life is chaotically ordered.

When perception exists, everything starts to be realized.

Dimensionality exceeds the boundaries of reason making coexistence a frame of polyvalent reference.

Categorization, classification, prioritization, organization are synonyms of the same lie.

Lying is necessary for those who believe in order.

Order is pure reason and reason is pure lie.

Life is our own fiction. We are created and recreated by our belief, by our own lie.

Shape, color, texture and dimension make difference to existence. But partial or total absence of them is not a non-existing sign.

Many times we believe that appearance is essential, will not existence be appearance?

Reason and logic do not always make beauty an art.

To believe and trust science as the only reliable path to knowledge leads those who follow it to an increasing complexity that is nothing more than the systematization of lies.

I do not say that lying is not useful; on the contrary, I know it is, especially when we want the other to see what we see.

The educational system is nothing more than a reproductive and stimulator apparatus of a system that tends towards the standardization of minds; science is the official language of the standard.

It would be interesting to cast a glance at non-official languages.

The most interesting phenomena in life always associate a big answer to a small sign.

The integrated whole turns its parts into a whole and the whole into parts of itself or a part of a parallel and complementary whole.

In space-temporal interactions autonomy is not possible in absolute terms but in related and relative context.

The self-organization principle has a process that has no end, the "organizational management process".

Another interesting principle related to living beings is the “economy and efficiency energetic principle”.

Dynamic complementarity is essential to individuals and to culture. As a consequence, a chaotic intolerable relation to a culture, a group or a tribe can become harmonious, tolerable or “acceptable to others”.

According to Karl Popper: “I do admit that at any moment we are prisoners caught in the framework of our theories, our expectations, our past experiences, our language...”

Each language has its own finite structures that make life partial.

Complexity, relativity, complementarity, neo-evolutionism, neo-positivism, intuitionism, nihilism, etc, belong to the Unamuno kaleidoscope.

*The world is a kaleidoscope in which logic has put man. The supreme art is fortuity. (Don Miguel del Unamuno)*

Science has started excluding what is apparently despicable. “Exception to the rule” we all are excluded nowadays.

Language as well as style are not casual, they have an intention to make the word a mechanism of power.

According to Cláudio Gutiérrez (neurophilosopher), " the truth is that each language has enrolled in itself its own limitations.

*Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge, where is the knowledge we have lost in information? (T. S. Eliot)*

According to Densi Najmanovich: " every doctrine creator, every theoretical or thinker that has a point of view is necessarily a dogmatic in a weak sense". So I accept a "weak and dogmatic" democracy and as a consequence, I take it on.

Weak dogmatism and skepticism are so alike to the point of recognizing the need for changing and transformation.

Complexity, a complex tissue of individual conditions in which one and multiples find balance to transform order and chaos into "ying" and "yang" and has cost so much to the westerners to accept it.

Relationships derived from interactions between Nature – Man - Culture and Objects are an auto poetic unity.

Culture creates/recreates its own signs and symbols to establish the universe in an appropriate space for its use and semantization ; as a consequence,

cultures are formed in communities with linguistic agreements stimulated by a cultural management that mark and places them in a particular atmosphere.

I know and I believe that they turned into a complete image that to construct/deconstruct a synergistic network definitely refers to the possibilities of the human reading mediation.

*In the heart of this video culture there is always a screen but not necessarily a look (glance?). (Jean Baudrillard)*

Mediatization telematics is the point between homo sapiens and homo technical.

Space is timeless; new cyber cultural relations take us to spaces that we have never been.

Media hyper-reality defends a new sensibility.

Heterogeneity, discontinuity, fragmentation, simulation, difference, simultaneity, pastiche, bricolage, randomness, etc. condense all sorts of mutagenic matrix affecting all areas particularly science and culture.

The cinematic motor is the manager of all technical cultural imagination, the interchange engine, the context transformer.

The cultural video paradigm reconfigures the image we have of art, science, technology, man, space, time, material, reality, truth, ethic, etc...

When all senses speak at the same time, images materialize themselves randomly, framing virtual links and weaving uninterruptedly in the experience space.

What point of view driven to technological practicality is the best to live in?

Catholic subterfuge, cinematic motor, cyber travelers denote an underworld that recommends a new pos individual, pos industrial state.

The vanguard adventure in the digital space takes another color and is embodied by re-semanticizing images that are established through "colleges" and pastiches which are proper of a new relation structure.

Cyber processes charge for the life inside and outside the "homo maquinas" relations losing distance for both and creating digital hybrids (cybor).

More and more, the machine-tool transforms the thinker man into a tool man making the single creative "Morris" an object of his object.

Cyber hypertext reads and reads itself creating new forms of writing and new interpretative resources.



Human relations transumanize into “bits” creating immortal minds without a body.

In digital art, time becomes eternal and the possibility to finish a work is reduced to nothing in a way that every created work is in continuous building process creating timeless systems from relations produced inside it.

The new digital guarantee makes virtual reality a new way of multidimensional visions that catch neural networks into new interconnections and decoding its binary language in mixed images lost between physical and virtual.

## **15. SCIENCE, ETHIC, SOCIETY**

Technological utilitarian advertising confirms a positive belief in science and validates it within the social-culture context nearly as a religion.

Human being (not scientific) accepts science reluctantly and as he does not understand it, or understands it just a little, he does not question it directly; he still does not connect to it, does not participate.

Science and technology are endowed with

mutability character that opposes to an innate prudence of non-urban cultures.

Tradition is the synonym for stability, "Someone would say that it means returning to the womb".

Despite scientific-technical work denotes constant changes, the scientific work tends to be conservative, do not question its origin or the meaning of what it does, for it believes (has faith) in the very sense of science, its science.

The scientist does not stay immune to a scientific magic-religious vision; but to a non professional it is different, he believes he is closer to the magic fountain, as if he had a special power.

Proximity to this magic fountain gives power to the scientist, but at the same time, makes him vulnerable and predictable converting him into cultural techno-scientific chief prosecutor, therefore its paradigmatic vision becomes very limited.

The scientist is the supreme priest of science.

"The scientists are the heirs of fear and hatred that formerly had from the heretics, the infidels, the Gypsies, the Jews, the witches and the magicians".  
(Oscar Handlin)

Are scientist victims or victimizers of magical

cultural heritage?

How far is the magician and/ or the wizard from the current scientists?

Why were Newton and other great scientists of his time practitioners of occult science such as alchemy?

Why the name occult science instead of another one that does not complicate the expression "Science"?

Fear of Frankenstein's monster persists.

Now, the possible monster appears with genetic manipulation, cloning, transgenic plants, transgenic animals, transgenic drugs, genetic therapy, etc.

*"Language is a system of citation" (Jorge Luis Borges)*

I love the reasons that make the sense of tact a relief.

*"For fear that- is man's original and fundamental feeling; through fear everything is explained, original sin and original virtue. Through fear there grew also my virtue, that is to say: science"*

*For fear of wild animals that has been longest fostered in man, inclusive of the animal which he concealeth and feareth in himself - Zarathustra called it "the beast inside". (Frederico Nietzsche. Thus spoke Zarathustra)*

For an empirical social scientist (experimental) mathematics legitimate somehow his lie; even when their parameters are not the most indicated. (Political researches, for example).

Eco ethic is based on micro, meso and macro ethic dimensions, reshaping the need of the existence and giving us a new perspective: "Geometrical vision of life".

Everyone is free to decide what to do with his life. But, if this decision affects others that do not agree with this ( like smoker in front of non-smokers) then, this person threatens others' bioethical rights.

*" Life is an hourglass that constantly goes down and comes back running again and again; a minute of time in which all conditions that determine existence run back to the orbital time". ( Eduardo Ovejero y Maury)*

We justify our existence pretending that what really matters is what we do.

The hope of sailing is fearful. Fearful are paternal genes in all their magical combinations, and it is fearful the environment that receives the product of so much randomness. Is life so fearful? Is there a minimal sense behind all this bad luck?

How to combine genetic intelligence and human reason?

Ask Einstein genes "If God does not play dices, who does?"

Is bad luck the inevitable consequence of preexisting order according to thermodynamics law? How about the human beings? So what?

What would the possibilities be that our chances are small or not likely under other logic? I do not refer to the possibility of an event takes place or not; but that its appreciation and /or meaning are usually different from the expected.

Political tendencies are quite similar to religious attitudes, in which one believes to be the owner of the truth.

In politics, voting is the cup of salvation.

In politics, voting is not only a civic act, but it is also an act of faith.

Faith and/or doctrine are a sociological excuse to separate us.

This new civilization in which we are creating difference should be a symbol of union and complement.

Sometimes, the good is ethically evil and the

evil is ethically good.

New moral models are similar to the tabs of the white hats of the American West movies; or super-heroes like Superman.

Soap operas also create values.

What would happen if through these means we could promote solidarity values such as anti-racism (any anti-discriminatory value), organ donation, respect for traffic rules, love for the family, etc.?

The answer is simple: we would no longer watch soap operas.

Pathologies are escape routes from the ethical and/or civic.

Lie is always necessary.

Excessive fear to misconception and imperfection is equivalent to the fear of God that turns fanatic religious into robots without its own criterion.

In consequence, lie is a divine virtue.

Millennial magic is now expressed through its conduits:

Science (legitimate magic);

Esoterism (astrology, numerology, etc.);

Politic and economy (ideological magic);

Religious cults, mystical sects, fanatics about sports, games, artists, etc. (cultural magic);

Urine therapy, crystal therapy, music therapy, aromatherapy, "etecetherapy" (magic therapy). Any element of this group that turns the magician into a live being in daily life are signs of the existence of human beliefs that trespass the limits of the human logic.

Nothing escapes the magic for even non-belief in nothing is to believe, and do not believe in nothing means to believe .It already represents an effort of faith and a conviction.

In this sense no one escapes the mystic.

In many cases, magicians are better therapists than psychologists, psychiatrists and priests.

To a writer, imagination and reality sometimes become confused; and it comes to a point where we do not reach the origin of a memory: " we do not know the right science, if we lived it, if we were told about it, if we dreamed or imagined it". However, what matters one way or another in the end is the memory, and therefore it is worth living.

In spaces far from the memories all the origins

get together.

And some ask themselves, why do the elders recall as much?

Memory is past and it lasts longer than present. Therefore, recall is turning the past into a continuous present.

If recalling is negative, sometimes, they mark lives and frustrate destinies; if positive, sometimes, they motivate and enhance lives. Memory is learning.

It is true that without memory we would live in a continual beginning of things and we would not make changes or progress. But, is our memory a faithful witness of our lived experiences?

Can we always trust our memory?

Can we always say that the memory is what is really lived: not a dream, a movie or something someone has told us?

If the world was a faithful and accurate reflection of what we think, would it be the possible to have different opinions from our own conscience?

Is it possible that the unthought also occurs?

Is it possible to visualize a world out of the human rationing?



Man who creates what exists is also creator of what he does not desire?

If man is not responsible for all the creation, who is?

Someone will say that man is not the creator of a mountain, a river, a volcano and /or a storm, but he is the creator of the global heating, the forest devastation, the death without reason and the air contamination.

Man has not create the original atmosphere, but he created the one we have today.

Man has not created the mountains, but the houses on the cliffs.

Man has not created the catastrophes, but may have encouraged some.

Obviously, the human being is not God, but is he the devil?

According to Popkewitz (1999); "Institutionally psychology has replaced the moral philosophy to provide a scientific focus on the salvation of the soul".

The learning of the soul is the openness to new experiences.

*"When the disciple is willing to learn, he is accepted, recognized and admitted. It must be so for he has lit the lamp and it cannot be hidden" (Mabel Collins. Light in the path)*

*Know, O disciple, that those who have passed through the silence, and felt its peace and retained its strength, they long that you shall pass through it also. Therefore, in the Hall of Learning, when he is capable of entering there, the disciple will always find his master. (Mabel Collins. Light in the path)*

*The man best calculated to make general advancement along occult lines is the one who avoids running to extremes in any one of the branches of the subject, but who while in the main following his own inclinations toward certain form of "Yoga" still keeps up a general acquaintance with the several phases of the great philosophy. In the end, man must develop all his many traces, and, why not, keep in touch with all traces while we journey along. By following this course we avoid one-sidedness; fanaticism; narrowness; short - slightedness and bigotry. (Yogi Ramacharaka. Fourteen lessons in Yogi Philosophy and Oriental Occultism)*

**There are two classes of man: one who is ready to learn and one who is ready to teach.**

**Many times, the best disciple becomes the best master when he discovers that his mission is to become a vehicle of the divine magic.**

**Many times, the best master becomes the best disciple when he understands that education is only another dimension of his own eternal and divine learning process.**

**Another religion and/or the cult of man by man**

is the money cult.

Equilibrium in life is the center of all growth process; and money does not escape from this reality.

Money is not sinful, but it is not the center of everything. In this sense, there might be a relative equilibrium between the spiritual and material universe.

Money is only a conscious expression of our material nature.

Materialist ethics divides the world into poor and rich. Religious ethics divides the world into fair and unfair. God's ethic does not always answer to these logics.

The problem is not to believe or not, the problem is: what to do with what we believe?

*Simplification, reduction, determinism, historicism and certainty do not result in enough marks to realize the variety and complexity inherent in success, events and happenings in all possible ways ( or impossible) starring and overlapping them constantly. (Edgar Balaguera. La escuela enferma)*

Professional ethics should not be ethics by and for the patron. They should be ethics for life.

Peace is a word that makes sense when there is a war.

Carelessness is existence and the mistake is necessary.

We are so constant and predictable that psychologists classify us into categories, and the ones believed not to belong to any category belongs to “the category of the unbelievers”.

Popular science is publishable science, whose greatest expression we see in science fiction movies.

Science fiction filmmakers are like theoretical scientists, since both starts from reality to create something that is not yet possible to demonstrate (far beyond the numbers).

Who does not dream of becoming a worker of his own thoughts?

The clock symbolized the former mechanistic paradigm; there are several simultaneous paradigms today, but if we dare to search for a symbol, maybe it is the computer.

It is not the calculation process that symbolizes new times since they belong to the Aristotelian binary logic (exception to the released logic still being developed in robotic systems), but the virtual logic that comes from the internet.

## **16. INTERNET AND ITS POTENTIALITY ARE A**

## **NEW PARADIGM.**

Internet is so plural and diverse that we still ask ourselves, how to regulate ethics in it? Meanwhile we think: Internet moves too fast.

Cyberculture contains a new way of life.

And, as in all competitive society (social Darwinism) there is always the ones who adapt to changes better and faster.

Now, it is natural selection when human being creates new situations, new systems, new structures, new rules etc., or should we call it artificial selection?

Farewells are not real and reunions are just distractions of time.

Spiritual turns plural into something natural.

Science and technological development acquires greater importance when used as political advertising.  
Ex: "War of the galaxies."

Science is also an object of ethics discussions especially when the war is sponsored and/or promoted by a supposed progress.

Peace, sometimes disguises itself as science.

Is it necessary to destroy and to kill to live and become better?

Do Only the best have the right to live? Is it natural selection?

And what are the best? Which are the criteria to this selection?

*"I have given a name to my pain and call it 'dog': it is just as faithful, just as obtrusive and shameless, just as entertaining, just as clever as any other dog—and I can scold it and vent my bad moods on it, as others do with their dogs, servants, and wives."*<sup>1</sup> (Friederich Nietzsche. *Eternal return*)

Institutional ethics is said to be a kind of standard director of human behavior, but definitely we do not know; so what justifies what?

Is the institution the justification of human behavior or is the human behavior that justifies the creation of institutions?

Are both or none?

Are natural moral orientations from institutions such as: church, school, factory, militia, family, prison, hospital, mental hospital etc.?

If there were none of the moral orientations expressed above, how would our lives be?

Would we confess in bakeries?

We would study anything in mental hospital (but psychology and psychiatry)

Would we take excursions to mental hospitals?

Science, religion and politics are three weapons of the same caliber.

It is typical of political and popular religion to make their congregation to believe that voting is the magical solution to all problems.

The devil of love creates destruction through a peace that needs the war. Is this the only possible logic?

The logic that kills in the name of love is the same that makes us see as normal and daily what is unpleasant and hateful.

Is this culture, our culture, the promoter of self-destruction as a way/reason of life?

H.G.Wells said:

*This accursed science is the same devil. If we fight with it, it gives us gifts. And, as soon as it takes us, it knocks us to pieces in some unexpected way. Old passions and new weapons.*

*Now it upsets your religion, now it upsets your social ideas,  
now it whirls you off to desolation and misery. (Oscar Handlin)*

We are victims of our own beliefs.

We create our gods, our devils.

We are slaves of our own lies.

Lies justify our existence.

Would life make sense without supreme truths,  
without personal metaphysics or characters that want  
to live beyond their time?

What do we live for?

Do we need referents /references in order to  
explain ourselves?

Is the object the explanation of the subject?

If the object is the explanation of the subject,  
then we only understand ourselves after the creation of  
the object and not before that.

But, if the object and the subject are the same,  
then we exist before the object.

The object cannot be naive, because if it is, so is  
the human being.

*"An integral being knows without going, sees without looking*



*and accomplishes without doing. (Lao Tzu)*

Life has meaning only when we search for it. All that is left is intellectual lie.

*"Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge, where is the knowledge we have lost in information? (T.S.Elliot)*

The structural- functional conception pays special attention to the categorization of society. In this sense, the required systematization combines common elements and associate them in status groups which are defined as: indicators, patterns, social systems program and human behavior, rates, etc. These classifications are mainly focused in the search of similarities and/ or related elements leaving aside the opposites; on the other hand, they establish Aristotelian distinctions based on logical opposites called dialectics where irreconcilable differences are built. In both cases, in search for regularities (similarities) or fighting for the opposites (dialectics), the results always respond to the same binary and extreme logic.

## **17. TRANSCOMPLEX APHORISMS**

A transdiscipline does not rethink itself constantly; it is nothing more than another discipline.

Transdisciplinarity has to transform each idea in a distinct discipline which joins harmoniously in life's metatext.

The complex of complexity lies on the fact that its genesis and practice are not in the academy, not even the academy knows its complexity.

If the complex does not pass through the social, it is nothing more than an interesting speech.

In education, the complex thought is similar to Paulo Freire's thought; everyone appoints it but nobody applies it

If we were all equal, transdisciplinarity would be just a rare 21 letter word.

The complex thought cannot be in the level of the fashion, since it is ephemeral and superfluous.

The academic architecture does not speak of teaching, freedom and harmony; on the contrary, speaks of surveillance, control and punishment.

The education standardizes itself, punishes the body and promotes uniformization.

Time in education leads to a vision inherited

from the perception of human nature.

Mental time of each human being is different from the chronological time/ model of the current school.

Thought does not have a timetable.

High Education follows encapsulated in a hegemonic view of the Middle Ages and does not allow the free flow of knowledge.

Complementarity has not been a lesson and far less a practice in our universities and investigation institutes.

Science and technology still are properties of a few.

It is not enough that scientists and technologists report their works to their pairs, the communities also should build with them.

So far, scientists and technologists used a unidirectional language that does not build anything new.

Scientific disclosure still is a deaf dialog in English for the elites; and when it reaches the nerds its understanding is almost zero.

Scientific disclosure develops as information and not as building knowledge.

Our scientific improvements are not incorporated

to our educational programs at all levels.

Science and art continue to be a taboo as well as the science and the spiritual.

Objectivity continues to be a mistake in the face of the alleged presence of a neutral speech.

If objectivity was so powerful, there would be no manipulation in the results of some experiments.

The proof in science is always an option, but who does that?

Wine is good for health. Who said so? A scientist who works in a winery.

Scientific knowledge is not the only nor always the more appropriate way to solve problems.

Although the academy has created a system to give power to doctors as investigators. Not all the doctors investigate and, on the contrary, many do not do so.

To our community, a doctor is the one who gives or rescues life; and, in most cases, this or that, do not have the degree of a doctor (from the academic point of view)

An ecological socialism would incorporate the human species on the planet, leaving aside the anthropocentric view so far and would show a more

human focus from the global

Ecophilosophy study, and in particular, the GAIA theory must be incorporated in all study programs.

God is ecological and transdisciplinary.

*"An artist is not a special kind of man, but every man is a special kind of artist". (Ananda Coomaraswamy)*

All children must be given the possibility to develop their innate abilities.

*"If we taught all children equally we would reduce their opportunity, whatever that was. Once we all were an egg where the genes of our parents were blended. Before and after the conception, our genetic composition is blended so that we are different from our parents. When we are born it is given to each one of us a new register to make sure that we are not identical. Some are born with a hand of aces and kings, others with dukes. It is fair that we admire a player able to deceive or to make a good defense with an imperfect hand. We admire him much more than the one who merely carries the triumphs given to him by the responsible to give cards". (James Lovelock)*

Love is a woman who can see with her eyes closed.

## 18. BIBLIOGRAPHY

AYRES, R. y MILLAR, S. Robotics. Aplicaciones and Social Implication. Cambridge. Mass Ballinger Press:1983.

BALIBAR, F. La science du crystal. París: Edit. Hachette,1991.

BARBAULT, R. Ecologie generale. París: Edit. Masson,1990.

BARBULT, R. L 'Evaluation publique de la science et la technique, une urgence democratique. En varios : L'Etat des sciences et des techniques. París: Edit. La Decouverte,1991.

BATESON, Gr. Mind and Nature. A Necessaruy Unity, New York: Bentam Books,1979.

BAUDRILLARD, J. L'illsion de la fin. París: Edit. Galilée,1986.

- BLANC, M. L'effet des changement technologiques. París: Edit. La Decouverte,1990.
- BRAUN, E. Wayward Technology. Londres: Edit. Frances Printer,1984.
- BENSON, I /LLOYD, J. New Technology and Industrial Change. New York: Edit. Nichds Pupliching,1983.
- BERGE, P. Le chaos, mode démploi . En varios: L'Etat des ciencias et des techniques. París: Edit. La Decoouverte,1991.
- BERGER, R. L'effet des changement technologiques. Lausana: Edit. P.M. Favre,1983.
- BOHR, N. Light and Life,1932. Reprinted in: Niels bohr: Atomic Physics and a Human Knowledge. New York: Sciencie Editions,1961.
- BROOKS, D and E.O. Wiley. Evolution as Entropy. Toward a Unified Theroy of Biology. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press,1986.
- BROOOK, D, J. C, B. M, J.D.H. Smith and E. O. Wiley.  
Entropy and Information in Evolving Biological Sustems. In:  
Biology and Philosophy 4:1989 [407-432].
- BRZEZINSKI, Z. La era tecnotrónica. Buenos Aires: Edit. Paidós,

1979.

BUFFEAUT, E. Dans les traces des dinosaures. Paris: Edit. Presses-Pocket, 1991.

BUS, L. The Evolution of Individuality. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

COOPER, B. Michel Foucault. An Introduction to his thoughts, New York: Edwin Mellan, 19781.

DELEAGE, J.P.Histoire de l'écologie. Paris: Edit. La Decouverte, 1991.

DEPEW, D. L. and BRUCE H. W. Darwinism Evolving: Systems Dynamics and the Genalogy of Natural Selection. Cambridge, MA: Bradford/The MIT Press,1995.

EMMECHE, C. The Emerging Science of Artificial Life. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1994.

DIAZ, E/TEXERA, Y/, Vessuri, H. La Ciencia Periférica. Caracas: Edit. CENDES – Monte Avila, 1983.

DI CASTRI, F. L'Écologie, les défis d'une science en temps de crise. Paris: Edit. La Documentation Française, 1984.

DIVERSOS A. Tecnología Alternativa. Madrid: Edit. Blume, 1990.



DROUIN, J.M. Reinventar la nature : L'écologie et son histoire.  
Paría: Edit. Desclée,1991.

DUCLOS, D. La peur et le savoir : la société face à la science,  
la technique et leurs dangers. Paris: Edit. La  
Découverte,1989.  
L'Homme et les risques technique. Paris : Edit.  
L'Harmattan, 1991.  
Les industriels et les risques pour l'environnement. Paris  
: Edit. L'Harmattan, 1991.

EKELAND, I. Au Hasard. Paris: Edit. Seuil, 1990.

ELSTER, J. El cambio tecnológico. Barcelona: Edit. Gedisa, 1990.

EMMECHE, C (forthcoming). Den biosemiotiske tanke. In Keld  
Gail Jorgensen (ed.) Kobenhavn: Gyldendal, [1991].

EMMECHE, C and JESPER Hoffmeyer. From Language to Nature:  
The Semiotic Metaphor in Biology, *Semiotica* 84 (1/2):  
1991[1-42].

ETXEBERRIA, A. Embodiment of Natural and Artificial. *Agentes* In  
G. Van de Vijver, S., 1995

FERGUSON, A. Tecnología, Ecología y Sociedad: repensando la  
técnica. Ponencia presentada al Seminario: Repensar la  
Técnica. San Cristóbal: Septiembre, 1993.

- FERRI, L. La Ecología profunda. México: Revista Vuelta. N° 192, Noviembre,1992.
- FORESTER, T. The information Technology Revolution. Oxford: Edit. Basil Blackwell, 1982.
- FOUCAULT, M. The Order of Things. An Archaeology of the Human Sciences, London: Tavistock,1970.
- FLOKIN, M. Conceptos of Molecular Biosemiotics and of Molecular. [1974]
- GIRAL, J y GONZALEZ, Tecnología Apropiada. México: Edit. AM., 1980.
- GLEICK, J. La Theorie du chaos. París: Edit. Flammarion,1991.
- GREDIAGA, R. Reconstrucción de la tecnología como objeto de estudio. México: Revista Mexicana de Sociología. N° 1., Enero – Marzo, 1987.
- GOODWIN, B.C. Evolution and the generative order. In B. Goodwin and P. Saunders (eds). Theoretical Biology: Epigenetic and evolutionary order from complex systems. Edinburgh: University Press,1989.
- GOULD, S. Wonderful Life: The burgess Shale and the Nature of

- History. New York : Norton,1989.
- GROS, F.: L'ingenierie du vivant. París : Edit. Odile Jacob, 1990.
- GREGORY, R. L. (eds). The Oxford Companion to the Mind.  
Oxford: Oxford University Press,1987.
- GRIFFITHS, P and Russel D. G. Developmental Systems and  
Evolutionary Explanations. In: Journal Of Philosophy, nº 91,  
1994 [277-304].
- HABERMAS, J. Ciencias y Técnica como "Ideología". Madrid: Edit.  
Tecnos, 1986
- HAWKING, S. Une breve histoire du temps. París: Edit.  
Flammarion, 1989.
- HERBIG, J. El final de la civilización burguesa. Barcelona: Edit.  
Critica,1982.
- HOFFMEYER, J. The Constraints of nature on Free Will. In: Viggo  
Mortensen and R.C. Sorensen (eds). Free Will and  
Determinisma. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1987  
[188-200].
- HOFFMEYER, J. Some Semiotic Aspects of the Psycho- Physical  
Relation: The Endo Exosemiotic Boundary. In: Thomas A.  
Sebeok and Jean Umiker-Sebeok (eds).

Biosemiotics: The Semiotic Web 1991. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992 [101-123].

HOFFMEYER, J. The Swarming body . In: Irmengard Rauch (eds) Proceedings of Sth Congress of The International Association for semiotic Studies, Berkeley: Mouton Gruyter (forthcoming), 1994a.

HOFFMEYER, J. The Swarmin Body. In: Irmengard Rauch (eds.), Proceedings of Sth Congress of The International Association for Semiotic Studies, Berkeley : Mouton Gruyter (forthcoming): 1994b.

HOFFMEYER, J. The Unfolding Semiosphere. In: Gertrudis van de Vijver, Stanley Salthe and Manuela Delpos (cd 5.) Proceedings of the International Seminar on Evolutionary Sustersms, Vienna, (forthcoming): 1995a.

HOFFMEYER, J. The Swarming Cyberspace of the Body, Cybernetics & Human Knowing (1): 1995b, [1-10].

HOFFMEYER, J. Molekularbiologie und Genetik in Semiotischer Scht. In: Thure von Uexkijll (cd)

Psychosomastische Meizin, 5. Auflage. Mjinchcn: Urban & Schwarzenderger,1995c [53-62].

HOTTOIS, G. Le signe et la technique. Paris : Edit. Aubier,1984.

JACOBIAK, F. *Matriser L'information critique*. París : Edit L.E..O., 1998

JACQUARD, A. *Voice le temps du monde fini*. París: Edit. Seuil, 1991.

KAUFFMAN, S. *Antichaos and Adaptation*. *Scientific American* 265: 199 [178-84].

KAUFFMAN, S. *Origins of Order: Self-Organization and Selection in Evolution*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

LANZ, R. *Cuando todo se derrumba. Crítica a la Razón Ilustrada*. Caracas: Edit. Tropykds, 1992.

LANGTON, Ch (ed). *Artificial Life. The proceedings off and Interdisciplinary Workshop on the Sunthesis and Simulation of Living Systems held, September 1987 in Los Alamos, Red wood City: Addiison-Wesley, 1989.*

LEWONTIN, R. *Facts and factitious in natural science*. *Critical Inquiry* 18 (1): 1991 [140-153].

LEWONTIN, R.. *The Dream of the Human Genome*. *The New York Review*, May 28, 1992 [31-40].

LYOTARD J.F. *La condición Postmoderna*. Madrid: Edit.

- Cátedra, 1989. MARGULIS, L. Symbiosis in Cell Evolution: Life and Its Environment on Earth. San Francisco: Freeman, 1981.
- MARGULIS, L and René Fester (eds). Symbiosis as a Source of Evolutionary Innovation. Speciation and morphogenesis. Cambridge, Mass/London: MIT press, 1991.
- MARGULIS, L and Dorion S (1991). Mystery Dance. On the Evolution of Human Sexuality, New York: Summit Books.
- MARRAMO, G. Poder y secularización. Barcelona: Edit. Península, 1989.
- MARCUSE, H. Razón y revolución. Barcelona: Edit. Alianza, 1980.
- MORENO, A. El aro y la Trama. Caracas: 1995.
- MIRES, F. El orden del caos. Caracas: Edit. Nueva Sociedad, 1995.
- OLDING-S. and Bernard P. The Genotype Phenotype – Envirotypes Complex: Ecological and Genetic Inheritance in Evolution, Manuscript, 1994.
- OYAMA, Susan. The Ontogeny of Information. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- OYAMA, S. The Accidental Chordate: Contingency in Developmental Systems The South Atlantic Quarterly 94

(2): 1995 [509-526].

PATERSON, H E. H. Collected Writings. In: Shane F. McEvey (eds.)  
Evolution and the Recognition concept of species.  
Collected Writings. Baltimore: the John Hopkins  
University Press, 1993.

PRIGORINE, I and Isasbelle S. Order out of Chaos. London:  
Heinemann, 1984.

ROCHA, L. Contextual Genetic Algorithms: Evolving  
Developmental Rules in Artificial Life Models. In:  
Gertrudis Van de Vijver, Stanley Salthe and Manuela  
Delpos (eds.)  
Proceedings of Proceedings of the International Seminar  
on Evolutionary Systems, ISES. Vienna: forthcoming.  
1995.

ROSEN, R. On Information and Complexity. In: J. L. Casti and  
A. Karlqvist (eds.) Complexity, Language, and Life:  
Mathematical Approaches. Berlin: Springer, 1985.

RUSE, M. The Darwinian Revolution. Chicago/London: University  
of Chicago Press, 1979.

SALTHER, S N. Formal Considerations con the Origin of Life.  
Uroboros 1:1991 [45-56].

- SALTHE, S N. Development and Evolution. Complexity and Change in Biology. Cambridge, mass, J London: MIT Press, 1993.
- SAPP, J. Evolution By Association. A History of Symbiosis, New york/Oxfor: Oxford University Press,1994.
- SEARLE, J. The Rediscovery on Mind. Cambridge Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1992.
- SEBEOK, T. Communication in Animals and Men, Language 39: 1963 [448-466].
- SEBEOK, T. Contributions to the Doctrine of Signs, Bloomington. In: Indiana University Press, 1976.
- SEBEOK, T. The Sing & Its Masters. University of Texas Press, 1976.
- SHAROW, A. Biosemiotics. A functional-evolutionary Approach to the Analysis of the sen. In Thomas A. Sebeok and Jean Umiker-Sebeok (eds.). Biosemiotics: The Semiotic Web 1991. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter,1992 [ 345-373].
- SWENSON, R. Emergente Attractores and the Law of Maximun Entropy Production, Systems Research 6: 1989 [187-197].
- SWENSON, R and M.T. T. Thermodynamic Reasons for Perception-Action Cycles, Ecological Psychoiogy 3(4): 1991 [317-348].



UEKULL, T. v.: Introduction: Meaning and Science. In:  
Jacob von Uexkull's, 1982 S. Wicken. Evolution in  
Thermodynamic Perspective: an Ecologica Approach,  
Biol. Phil. 4: 1989 [373-405].