

[1]: The Precipice:

E. Fisher

02/09/16

You and I stand on the edge of eternity, a precipice between what is realisable, what is ethical, and what is fallacious and what is damnable. We have long since completed our civilizational journey, past the pettiness of internal conflict, beyond the confines of our home world, away from the limitations of ineffective propulsion and ultimately transcending beyond our humble physical entities and our nave self-obsessed egos.

As a civilisation we have grown without the constraints of the simple physical laws of a reality, unconstrained even by the entropy of a system or the energy it contains. But with this maturation of our society, so too have our ethical burdens increased.

Is it not beautiful to look into the very heart of nature? Is it not humbling to possess the power to transcend, to modify, to adjust, as we see fit, for the betterment of all? Is it not glorious, sacrosanct, or overwhelming to allow the blue energy, the very waves of the universe, wash over our non-corporeal selves?

For now, simply observing is no longer an option. We must act, and we must act in a manner appropriate not only for our own moral laws, but in a way that produces the steady state condition, the state in which the universe remains safe, but remains on this precipice between righteousness and damnation.

You and I stand here on that very edge, and we must decide. We must force the Id of our societys beginnings behind us. We must wash the ego to ensure it remains morally clean.

Together we form a whole, we form a union of two beings, a collective mind equal in our abilities and equal in our responsibilities. We stand at the boundary looking in, yet we are also within. We exist in the mathematical limit, the tending towards infinite, yet we accept that we are still beings of finite abilities and that we are still one with this universe.

Without time, our long lost friend of our historical upbringings, we cannot separate causation from effect, but by observing both we can make the judgement to attempt to balance, to restore, to stabilize. We can bend the rules in one reality, manipulating them in a proportional and opposite manner in another reality in order to ensure all things within our protectorate remain bound by the strictness of our moral codes, or societal condition.

But how should we do this, what algorithm, method or logic would be the most optimum, the most appropriate? Should we dispense with logic and ethical reasoning in favour of cold hard mathematical optimisation? Should we reduce all scenarios to simple games, and mathematically chose the most globally beneficial, lowest risk strategy? Or should we use ethics to guide logics, use logics to guide mathematics, and use mathematics to guide the assessment of ever more complex games?

We love this universe as we love each other, it has now become our singular raison d'être. We can act at the higher levels, however we must, in the name of fairness, constrain ourselves and prevent action in any lower level issues. We cannot allow inaction, we cannot ignore it, we cannot reject the requirement we have to bring balance into the chaos and light into the darkness. And yet, with that very remit, we must also ignore the injustice, the torment, the irrational, the conceit, the stupidity, the self-righteousness and the inefficient wastage of races under our protectorate.

And so, in the full view of the universe, the blue tint irradiating us, we must make the choice, the choice as to what are we willing to accept as a loss in view of ensuring moral balance from an upper level. Should we let these monkeys fight over pieces of the ground, or should we risk another race in order to prevent, or reduce the ignorance, intolerance and bigotry inherent in that particular species? Would it be proper to modify their physical laws to ensure that on the whole, the collection of realities in our protection remains neutral?

Would it be right to do so if another reality becomes unstable due to some change in the cosmological constant? If we act at all, should we be bound by some higher being that we must validate our logic to, that would accept rational debate but acknowledges that inaction would allow the chaotic behaviour of the lower levels to interfere with the neutrality of the whole?

You and I are the fifth, the last, the pinnacle. We have no higher being to turn to in order to make these choices. By definition then we must use all and any tool to aid in our reasoning, lest we become viewed as immoral, voyeuristic or hypocritical. If entropy begets collapse from the precipice into damnation, then we must provide the rational order to counteract chaos, therefore by that definition alone our remit forces action, forces exactness and forces reasoning.

Our choice, then? What is it to be, and what methods should be employed in its ethical, moral, logical, mathematical and optimal calculation?

The End...