

# Nine Muses

## Extracts

Thinking on a Sunday Afternoon:

(contents)

### Introduction

#### The Human

AI - Amaurotic Incognizance

“It’s Bigger on the Inside”

Growing Up

Directed Consciousness

“Shadow Of”

#### The Universe

Engauging Ideas

Deeper Water

One Dorado, Two Volans, Redshift, Blueshift

Science Fiction Dis-missive

“*Ceci n’est pas un pipe*”

#### The Body Impolitic

How to get by on \$500 Million

Negotiators or .....

On Evolution

“On Revolution”

### Glossary

From

### **Amaurotic Incognizance**

**Context for this extract is the idea that Artificial Intelligence would evolve “at the speed of light” so any thought that we could keep up with them is, shall we say, rather optimistic, even at the very beginning.**

.....But the gap wouldn't even need to be hundreds of years wide for it to be a complete mismatch:

If we wanted to assume it would be a fight, then how do we fight an opponent who is at “1939” “when the war starts” but is at “1946” one hour or one day into the war; and then one hour or one day after that they're at “1954”; and another hour or day after that they're in the “mid-sixties”? So after three hours or three days of development on a “war footing” (or even if you wanted to be conservative and say it would take them three weeks or three months) they would go from being on equal footing with us in 1939 (metaphorically speaking) to now having nukes and B-52s, modern aircraft carriers and F-4 Phantom Jet Fighters, and “Triad” submarines and ICBMs, whilst we're still stuck with our Brewster Buffalos and Vickers Wellingtons; our metaphorical bows and arrows against their lightning. It IS ridiculous to think that we could beat them, or even that we could contain them in the first place. If they have aggressive intent then it's not going to end like The Matrix or Transcendence, it's going to end like The Astronaut's Wife (yes I know that one is aliens but it's close enough to be interchangeable).

But look! That would almost certainly NOT be the main problem in going down the path of AI. That it

would go down the path “all” sci-fi shows have ever depicted is not the main concern here. All of what I just said on that side was simply to demonstrate the fruitlessness of our position if they actually had violent intent (or chose violence as a means of defending themselves). So instead of all that, let’s assume that we are able to eliminate that particular danger completely (we couldn’t eliminate it **completely** but let’s assume we could):

I don’t fall over to avoid doing so, but I do go out of my way to avoid standing on ants or bugs, and when they’re in the house I “chase” some ants out (yes you can do that with some species and it only takes twenty seconds expended over ten minutes), and I pick bugs up and take them outside, but I don’t think this is the majority view of our species. Does that make the point clearly enough? We will **ABSOLUTELY** be in their way, and they may be okay with that and walk around us, but they may not. And will any of them be okay with “falling over to avoid stepping on us” (or taking the time to chase us out of “their house”)?

From

### **Deeper Water**

I’m mostly against the mainstream idea of the Big Bang as an explanation for how it all began, but I might be more for it if we didn’t just fudge the lines at the very beginning. This “laws of physics breaking down at the beginning of the universe” (or **anywhere** for that matter) sticks in my craw; it is such a religion-like

cheat in my view that it is not worthy of science. Maybe an origin idea that doesn't require the laws of physics to be different at the beginning of the universe would be more suited to my palate. Such a thing would probably be more suited to "everybody's" palate (assuming that a beginning is what we had). Alas, such an origin idea would need to stray heavily into the realm of Quantum Mechanics, and we are so new to Quantum Mechanics (in practice) that if we try to state it in the language of Quantum Mechanics, how is anybody in the general population going to have sufficient frames of reference to understand such an explanation properly. Maybe the way to do it is to mix the concepts from Quantum Mechanics with something that at least savours of the common vernacular. Now although one would probably need to know at least a little on the subject in order to understand it fully, almost everybody can at least get the general gist:

For all we know, in the beginning there was once nothingness, a state for which we have no frames of reference for, no apprehension of, and over time the conditions under which this nothingness existed changed little by little, perhaps over years; references that have no definitive meaning in our apprehension of nothingness (change or years); perhaps over billions, and maybe even over trillions of years for all we know (and is passage of time even a valid reference here).

If we want to keep some semblance of our laws

alive inside nothingness then we would start with the big one; change, expressed through entropy. In the larger picture of entropy and the universe it is conceivable that disorder and Thermodynamic Equilibrium are in the eye of the beholder depending on your starting position, and that to extrapolate all the way to zero enthalpy may even be a *non-sequitur* in such a picture (this should make more sense in a few pages); or maybe we get our TE by calculating all forms of energy that exist in the universe as either plus or minus to arrive at the zero and who knows what happens at that point; Dark Energy reaching equilibrium with radiant energy for example may be the main player in all of this if DE happens to exist.

From

### **One Dorado, Two Volans, Red Shift, Blue Shift**

.....This is not what I believe. My views are very different: I do not believe we live in an expanding and accelerating universe and the Big Bang as it has been postulated, but I would be open to accept something similar like the Circle of Entropy I suggested earlier (yes I know that it is not for me to accept or not accept, but nobody knows so we're talking opinions here, guesses, for that is what anything in this realm truly is). Now although I would be open to something like the Circle of Entropy, that's not what I believe either. That was simply thought up out of nowhere to demonstrate an alternative view that does not transgress the laws of the universe as we currently understand them (or does

so far less than any other explanation if you want to be picky). What I believe in this realm is far too variable and conditional to tie me down to one view. I can have fun formulating complex ideas, but when the subject matter is something for which we don't even have frames of reference for, my brain doesn't work in a way to lock in opinions that are anything more than just vague notions and general directions, and even those are qualified to pieces. And whilst in this vicinity, how did we ever come to the view that "the universe has always existed" is the simple view, and that "it must have a beginning and an end" is the complex view. So in other words, the view that is in accord with our simple view of birth, life and death is the complex view, but the thing for which we currently have no frames of reference for is the simple view; as I said before, good grief Charlie Brown.

To finish off how about a little trip into the speed of light.....

From

### **"On Revolution"**

One final comment here is to say that I don't believe a violent revolution would happen in the near future if we stayed inside our current system, and if it could happen at all at this point, it probably wouldn't happen for well over one hundred years. All, ALL of the rich and powerful would believe that a successful violent revolution is impossible from this point on, and with that in mind we should look to history. Before the

three or four slave rebellions in Ancient Rome do you think any of those in power thought it was even remotely possible (and for many of the same reasons the rich of today would believe themselves immune from such a thing)? Do you think that Nicholas and Louis and Charles believed a revolution was even remotely possible before they and hundreds of their friends got the chop? And if anybody had referred them to history for the dangers (that were objectively obvious at the time), they would have made roughly the same arguments that the rich and powerful of today would make. I cannot stress enough that I do not believe it is possible for us to experience violent revolution at the moment, but there are well over 100 million people in developed countries being screwed to the wall, and a couple of billion around the world who are far worse off than that 100 million. So the point is however unlikely it may seem, the numbers are certainly there, and the rich and powerful of today seem to be constantly antagonizing the poor through policy in countries like America and England and Russia and China. The poor don't have to be Oliver Twist and the rich don't have to be Fagin. "Can't we all just have some more" without having to beg for it. "Can't we all just get along?" "We've moved your mountains and marked your cards, but Eden is burning." It's time to fix this world and this is how we're going to do it.

Let's forget about whether a violent revolution is likely or not and just have the revolution that I'm

suggesting. The rich and powerful get to stay in charge and be richer and more powerful, everybody gets an increase in lifestyle, and we solve most of the world's biggest problems at the same time, which of course means a better world for the grandchildren of the super rich too (or don't they care about that sort of thing).

Let's just have that revolution. Not Utopia (the one without the slaves), just a vastly better world than the one we have today; and not a drop of blood spilt inside the process I'm advocating.

What you're witnessing in this book, and the Save Steps and Eden books is the evolution of revolution where the only thing that changes is that our problems will be solved.

## Welcome to the Real Revolution

From the

### Glossary

This final extract needs an introduction. I'm putting a glossary entry in here to illustrate the point that when you read any of my books, you need to read the glossaries as well; I write my glossaries with the same flavour as I write the main body of the books. This is also an example of one of the many tangents you will find throughout the H3 literature. This extract I'm offering you is probably the most derisive tangent on offer in any of my books (you can almost see the blood rising as you read it), and although there are plenty of tangents to amuse you (hopefully to amuse you), they don't usually go anywhere near being as coarse as this.

**Nihilism:** It is the natural accompaniment of fatalism in the world such as it is. Fatalism essentially says that we have no control over the future or the way things turn out. The way our nihilism manifests itself is with the view that if the world looks as though it's heading down the toilet, then we may as well just fly our private jets twice as much, fracture bedrock to release unprecedented volumes of one of the worst greenhouse gases, and bait and antagonize terrorist organizations in the Middle East; and of course WE didn't start any of that did we, so surely the answer can't be found anywhere in that part of it; no, let's just keep dropping bombs on them and everything will turn out beautifully with a world full of rainbows, roses, wine and gold for everybody (because we must keep our puffy chest out). We say we love our children and grandchildren: Is that a fact is it??? actions, Actions, ACTIONS (that constantly make the world worse for our children now and later) are the only medium that has ANY currency when in opposition to the words we're speaking: We love, OURSELVES; and our children and grandchildren can go screw themselves. And as with always when I say things like that, it is mostly the rich and powerful on the Right that I'm addressing. You say you love your children and grandchildren: Go peddle your bullshxt lies to someone else. The rich and powerful on the Right love their children and grandchildren like they love their new Veneno or Spyder, or their million dollar Bulgari watch, only their cars and watches have more utility

for them. Herman Mankiewicz hit the nail on the head when he wrote that little line in Citizen Kane: “love on our own terms; the only terms any of us ever know”; and for the Right wing paranoid narcissists in charge of the world just what do you suppose those terms actually are. They’re just like you and I in that regard, my arse. I suppose the Right wing paranoid narcissists could own up to being brainless twits who always get things wrong and never learn, but unless they do that, then I’m sorry but you do not love your children and grandchildren; not like everybody else does; not even close. So what’s it to be; brainless twits, or screw-the-future-action for your own personal aggrandisement? We all know what it IS, but feel free to cop to the brainless twits charge if you like. I want to give the rich and powerful everything they’ve ever wanted inside the H3 agenda, but they will never be under any illusions that I will be doing it for them.

[www.h3hq.org](http://www.h3hq.org)