

GENIUS

SUMMARY

“What is/would be genius in music?” has been the guiding question since I began music in 1999 - sometimes it has been subtle, simply looking for improvement in my own music, other times it has been aggressive, like the 2007-2012 period, and many times it has been the spirit of explicit investigation - Ideas Original has many such documents - the “genius” document itself, all “axiomatic” pages, “barriers/extremes”, “transfiguration” and “counterintuition”, “turning point”, “supersession”, “higher solution”, “full commitment”, etc. - then all documents were eventually injected with the genius impulse through generalizing them towards their full implications.

NS is my current answer to the “genius question”, yet much of the work has yet to be done - the “first options” for reifying a subject, for example, are those contained in “genius process/tasks” - creating gateways, new thought languages, anthological body-of-knowledge around the subject, among many others. NS’s outer shell, or structure, already corresponds to genius principles/criteria.

The original “genius” document is a continuing collection of notes and observations on “genius”. Genius as I define it is open-ended, unlimited and shape-shifting, so it will never be reached or achieved, much like Socrates’ wisdom, but the pursuance of it and the wielding of its historically-proven patterns, are the ultimate goals of my projects.

The “genius question” can be applied to any discipline via “I.O. as approach”

This document is the real purpose of Ideas Original - the highest tasks - Ideas Original *as an exposition of genius*

(and a reverse-engineering and codification of past genius)

The highest group of reification strategies in NS are “genius tasks” (see below)

Generalization/New Style significance:

Could inform NS reifications - the highest goals

Generalization:

All genius principles, properties, tasks Highest achievements, indicative of genius, in human context

All past incarnations of genius and conclusions drawn from them - aggregate experience of all geniuses

All “traits of God” - past human ability Generalization of each “trait of God” toward perfect incarnation

Omniscience The idea web etc.

“First man on earth” thought experiment - “perfect” anticipatory genius (generalized to all possible outcomes of initial conditions)

Genius task vs. time/context = perfect timing (connectivity/butterfly effect in perfect balance)

Subset: practical/workable genius “Blinding” genius

“Genius” as subjective/qualia - leaning toward higher definition

Maximization of achievement given limited resources (time, windows of opportunity)

+ Negative generalization: no...

PROPERTIES OF GENIUS

Caveats:

There is genius that supersedes your current understanding of what genius is.

There are genius tasks that you haven’t conceptualized yet.

“Genius knows what to do” - the intangible intuition, critical sense, ability to research, draw conclusions, make connections

Objective principles: learn from objective sources, i.e. not in ones own discipline/genre, and rather than people

See: objective principles document - universal forces, phenomena, ideas from other disciplines (interdisciplinary approach)

Many of the greatest composers show mathematical/geometrical principles within their compositions

Geniuses not only consider an option, but follow through, making it work (commitment) - allowing it to be *displayed* to the public for consideration
exercise: create a whole language around an unfeasible idea - following through with implications (what geniuses do)

“Genius as practical enlightenment”

Increased conception of the possible

Impossible (considering the impossible) (see NS/theoretical composition)

Genius is a perpetual challenge

Finding a vehicle for genius

An *open-ended* commitment to the highest possible outcome

Disregarding the “traps” posed by lower outcomes - the trap to be contented with the results of the lower level thought process

Open-minded to any solution that will elevate the composition

World refraction + singularity insistence (the insistence to refract the world using your own mind, despite the fact that others have done it before)

“Anthological ambition”

Individuality insistence (insistence of self and idea as a singularity - helps resist identification with other’s failures at same objective)

The highest level of creation is creating a self-contained world

Genius will always feel unease at another’s question, because it lacks context when compared to their internal system.

Genius must create their own contextual system around any question before they answer it

Refraction of the known into the profound (transformation of the familiar)

Compendium (the desire to create works that summarize everything that came before)

Inclusive self-context (ability to discover many disparate ideas and reconcile them within your own work, within the 'context of self')

Discover the previously non-existent

They must be in the position to make new discoveries - scientific and technical books

Must articulate the problems

Fixing slight flaws in current models = major breakthrough (Edison) = "sensitive unease"

Analyzing the work of other great minds

Sustained consistency of direction/idea = focus, sheer work

Experimentation

Technological innovation

Edison: "only invent things that he was certain the public would want"

lab contained "all the equipment necessary to work on any invention" - his research and lab facility was benchmark for others

Transfiguration (elevating)

Poetry context (viewing everything as a possible vehicle for the poetic - the mundane, the odd, everything = inclusive)

The idea of **refraction** is not a specific technique, but a simulation of how a different mind would see the same work

(specifically a greater mind, a counterintuitive mind)

Compositions that rely completely on extreme gesture raise expectations of eventfulness, thus needed something *more extreme* for climaxes

Language creation (uniting elements into a language coherently)

Coherent mannerism (submitting individuality into a larger context that submits it to logic)

Logic creation (your own logic)

New forms

Recognition of value in the past (people/ideas that were previously unrecognized) + advocating, wider exposure

Reverse valuation (valuing the unvalued) - see Counterintuition

Ugly beauty (considering ugly ideas as a source of beauty, and/or doing something not conventionally beautiful but considering it so)

Stupid beauty (considering stupid ideas)

Detail valuation (valuing an overlooked detail) detail amplification (overlooked aspect in other's work becomes central in yours)

Genius is valued against the pedestrian - therefore "fringe" ideas are exalted for their interestingness

Corroboration (radical thought process is shown as deliberate by consistent use (insistence) - variation 16 of Diabelli)

Audacity/ridiculousness

Serious ridiculousness (to insist on the seriousness of an audacious idea, and use it within a *serious context*)

"Stupid ideas" - see "ostentatious ideas about music" in July 2009

Close to foolishness, almost indistinguishable from it - only divided from it in retrospect

Radical implications (extend the implications of an evolution to its extremes, trace evolution to its logical conclusion)

Exceptional beauty

Metaphoric insistence (to compare radical interpretation to source, often close to unrecognizable, and still insist on similarity)

Context insistence (to insist that a new invention is related to predecessors, that it should be considered in the context of the others)

(i.e. you didn't "break rules" - you simply had a larger perception of what was lawfully possible)

Context change insistence (to insist that object from another context, placed in a new context, must be considered new)

Subtlety (inward detail)

Uncompromising (to insist that the work is understood on its own terms - rather than modify the work, modify the minds of the audience)

Faith in audience-understanding (assume all ideas in your work will be uncovered/appreciated by someone)

Poetic solution-alternative (in the name of poetics, resist the 'least resistance' solution for a more difficult or strange one)

(deny a less poetic solution to the same problem)

Counterintuitive - genius dislikes the predictable, or something *anyone* could have done

Idiosyncrasy

Localized taste (the wisdom to know where/when to apply certain innovations and when not to - esp. relating to counterintuition)

Fluency/Tone maintenance: the ability to maintain a consistent style/tone over many works, also tone *appropriateness* at any point (vs. drama, text)

"Supersede doctrines previously held as unquestionable"

Going against broader consensus (not crankism, however)

Their work allows building on top by others

Breadth of conclusions in life's work (Aristotle, Newton)

The measure of genius is how many ideas one comes up with, out of the available ideas (percentage of available ideas) = comprehensiveness

"Irreducibility of genius": cannot be simplified or made more complex

Genius creates things that the lesser artist cannot dissect

Genius often appears like organic complexity, but thought processes and inspiration sources are deeply hidden

Making complexity work

Ability to understand/create new levels of complexity (quantum physicists, Modern composers, Beethoven)

They must absorb all knowledge about the subjects of interest, thus putting themselves at the 'head' of the field

"Higher solution" theory

A higher level solution makes lower problems obsolete or solves them (like how a paradox is reconciled)
 Conversely, a lower level solution will leave fundamental problems unsolved
 If something seems difficult, is there a better solution? (especially if the limitations are treated as givens)
 = reject the difficulties altogether and develop a new way from scratch
 Level of discourse, level of agreement (don't argue details when fundamental premise is the problem)
 Don't trouble yourself with details when big picture innovation will make those details obsolete
 Question anything that claims to be a zero-sum game (look for a higher solution/reconciliation)
 "Refuse to play a game you have no chance of winning"

Ambiguity theory: artistic genius creates a momentary disorientation

Wit/humor (see humor context)

Show a playfulness with their audience - often doing ridiculous, clever or counterintuitive things to great effect

A dialogue with the listener, the music (whether composed or live) represents a performance in front of a listener
 (Why are live performances often more profound than the original? - the presence of a human audience)

Why? to "delight and challenge" audience, not simply meet expectations (*that are often based in normalcy*)
 expectations are most often of "the normal", so to "delight and challenge" one must seek abnormal/original solutions

Genius is clever - puts a smile on your face, "delights" audience (also challenges)

Genius is interdisciplinary Specialization-level in multiple areas

"Thought experiments"

"Being a master/genius is a non-cliché"

Long-term oriented - resists demands to "show" prematurely (only you are the arbiter of "when it's ready")

"Infinite capacity for taking pains"

Geniuses' ability to switch between hemispheres of brain (connectedness)

Unease with the methods of others

It is the challenge of a genius to raise his human/flawed side to the level of his genius. (i.e. transcend physical/mental limitations)

A genius follows the full implications of his path (doesn't stop short)

Even *the step* of asking "what are the full implications?" is profound

Historical place-time rightness: extreme timeliness

To access the correct solution at the time it is demanded

Demands a high level of professionalism *and speed* - and/or preparedness

Timeless rightness is also difficult - to endure, to be timely *into the future* Musical rightness
 sustained invention over many years

Tone *in execution* Audaciousness and originality without appearing foolish

Avoiding bad solutions, esp. b/c many amazing solutions are frighteningly close to bad ones

Wit used intelligently

The risk of audacity/assertion: audacity + taste = genius

Generation of the style (unless a conscious, militant, intelligently justified resurrection)

Strongest = first-generation, from the creator himself (Debussy)

Weaker = imitators, who perhaps can recreate the style convincingly but don't personally empathize with all the stylistic elements
 they haven't vetted/contemplated/*derived* the aspects of the style like the original creator "artificers"

Another genius can deliberately resurrect the style and use it to optimum end

Can even transfigure it by using it to a higher extent than even the original creator intended

Source matters: "geniuses" are given the benefit of the doubt, thus can get away with things that lesser artists can't

For instance - Sunday in the Park With George

Knowledge of the author/source could be the key difference between amazing and stupid (dog scene)

Childlike wit vs. stupid (Ghostface, Sondheim)

Genius is holistic - you can't necessarily rule out genius because of one element, and you determine genius based on multiple elements

Ghostface can be childlike because he's already demonstrated virtuosity and intensity, profundity

= like new style's multiple philosophical angles

His views on certain things are stupid (think Kanye), but we tend to read it as "a genius bearing his flaws for all to see"
 as even public intellectuals have been grievously wrong on important topics

A momentary genius' historical position can decline in the long run - true genius is differentiated from "fad"

Fad often distorts/inflates value - like something fading from urgency upon further scrutiny (Kanye's album)

The need people have to deem something genius can lead to premature labels of genius (whereupon fading occurs)

Problem context:

Given a task, how the genius “solves” the problems inherent in every level in the task
 Bbetter, more ingenious, higher solutions
 The number of times lesser expectations are exceeded
 Contentedness = inability to find problems = inability to solve problems = enemy to genius
 “Sensitive unease” = ability to see more problems
 “Overinclusiveness” = consideration of more possible solutions

Genius (from Beethoven’s Hammerklavier Sonata analysis)

“Genius exceeds expectations” - never do something and think it’s sufficient (thinking in terms of what is “required”)

Thinking in terms of what is required will never exceed expectations

The greats do beautiful things whenever they compose (Diabelli Variations)

They exceed the expectations within their own work (they deny a less poetic solution to the same problem)

“*Poetic solution*”

Formula for genius: valued aspects + “more” = genius (the *product of genius*)

More profound, more inventive, more complex, more *subtle*, more ambiguous, more eventful

Some values needed can come from looking at perceived deficiencies in other people’s work

Bach Fugues + more open, idiosyncratic, dramatic = Hammerklavier fugue

The question becomes: “*how to make it more ___*”

Genius often seems counterintuitive - something others would never try to do (or think is ugly, or think is impossible)

Genius is radical, edgy: Diabelli presents radical solutions to the variation “problem”, each poetic - no ‘pedestrian’ variations

Each is amazing in its own right (inventiveness)

Functional radicalism: genius shows the feasibility of a radical idea

“Successfully applies an unknown technique” - “never been seen previously”, “great originality”

“Genius hits a target no one else can see”

Independently arrive at concepts that are normally taught

“Non-imitative” - experimental

Lack “latent inhibition” - noticing more details than others

Corroboration: radical thought process is shown as deliberate by consistent use (insistence) - variation 16 of Diabelli

Gateway theory:

A phenomenon where a single new idea, original enough in some way thus peripheral enough versus existing ideas, creates a new dimension, opening up a world within/between known parameters that is unexpectedly vast and differentiated, like a membrane expanding from zero-mass, or roots of a massive tree grown from a single seed. The new idea spawns a discipline, a genre, etc., then many sub-disciplines and interdisciplinary branches.

This is what I.O. has already done: At the outset, I wanted to “create an alternative body of theory” to “ensure uniqueness” - for example, the theory of “transfiguration” led to “transfiguration strategies”, which led to ideas such as extremes/barriers and “transfigured ensembles”, which, when combined with theoretical generalization, led to a certain “flavor” of totality - generalization in regards to transfiguration. None of these are apparent when first looking at music theory - they were only accessible through the initial “gateway theory”. This is also the point of thought languages - to provide gateways to new/unforeseen “membranes” of thought, by thinking in a new way. Similarly, NS deliberately set out to do this - by predicating the system on so many concepts peripheral to those of traditional music, NS in some ways feels like a parallel universe.

This “membrane” concept also explains why disciplines and inventions that seem obvious in retrospect weren’t noticed and developed sooner - they lacked a context, lacked a space to assert their identity enough to be considered a named “thing” in their own right. Often it is a new way to organize, interpret or see existing things.

In NS, the highest reification tasks are gateways.

Minute distinctions become amplified, and lead to entirely new areas of discovery/creation

“Ask better questions” matrix - benchmark what questions scientists ask/have asked surrounding innovative experiments

= **questions as gateways:** they imply certain directions from an initial subject

Esotericism:

“Understood by a single person or those who are initiated” - an ideal of genius, a genius objective in “genius task/approach”.

The benefits of esotericism were exposed in mid-2011 development of the New Style, while analyzing James Joyce:

Understandability to an audience is a conscious factor in the creation of a work of art. Positively, the purpose of communication can encourage universality, coherence and economy. Negatively, it censors the creator by discouraging a certain level of complexity and personal meaning, especially if he is trying to push the boundaries of a subjective discipline (the task of “actualizing genius” for example).

This is where esotericism could be advantageous: without the burden of translation to other parties, the creator is liberated into greater complexity, irreducible complexity (no simplification from the original conception), more personal artistic objectives, more idiosyncratic terminology, the design of new thought languages (ways of thinking), and more layers of these factors. Personal terminology and layers of it (personally-created terms to explain other personally-created terms) have become an issue in the New Style, while personal subject matter (esp. specific names and places) is relevant in the autobiographical Opus 1. Against “100 Problems”, it can be argued that the more unique the composer/artist, the more he justifies his right to exist.

Aesthetically, esotericism can seem miraculous - as “coming from another world”, and revelatory - “new modes of thought”, thus is a useful approach to radical art. It would allow the New Style to develop without limitation. Objectively, it is often symptomatic of genius - Joyce’s dual novels, for example, where he seems to be writing (thus thinking) in an original way, unrelated to existing human language...

Measure: The outrageousness of idea in relation to the nature of the ideas that existed before it (in same field/discipline/addressing same question)
 Time is a better arbiter of greatness than “now”
 Genius is measured by achievements and goals of the genius (vs. I.O.)
 Genius in art: an “impractical” Prometheus (vs. Edison, Da Vinci, scientists, who are practical/pragmatic)
 A higher, more ambiguous level? (creating something for its own sake)

Objective genius:

The form of genius in disciplines where objective measures for genius achievement exist - vs. the arts, where “genius” is largely subjective, a matter of aesthetic judgment. One can objectively recognize the truth of a scientific principle or the ubiquity of an invention - this has to do with the nature of the work/output in the subject area.

Interestingly, music has this within it - there are “facts” of music that ‘prove’ one piece of music to be, for example, more complex or detailed in a certain dimension than another - whereas people can “argue” beauty, emotion or delicacy, they can’t argue “amount of layers” or “length”, “percentage of original harmonies” etc. (these are “facts”). Still, if useful on occasion (such as measuring the similarity of two parameter-based languages based on number of parameters in common), this has the potential to be terribly reductive.

Subjective genius:

Genius in disciplines that lack objective measures for genius achievement, versus utilitarian, quantifiable genius in other disciplines (“objective genius”). In the arts, “genius” is largely subjective, a matter of aesthetic judgment, whereas one can objectively recognize the truth of a scientific principle or the ubiquity of an invention - this has to do with the nature of the work/output in the subject area.

These form the two poles of a spectrum, and most genius lies somewhere in the middle - for example, influence on art or subsequent artists is a way to assess aesthetic genius, or the amount of ideas/concepts that didn’t exist before the artist, etc. There is generally more permanent and open-ended conflict between sources and levels of criticism in the arts than there are when the accomplishment has demonstrable utilitarian value. Music does possess certain “facts” that are able ‘prove’ one piece of music to be, for example, more complex or detailed in a certain dimension than another - “amount of layers” or “length”, “percentage of original harmonies” etc., but is usually reductionist in description of a quality like greatness.

“What genius doesn’t do”:

- Take something as a given (unless they freshly legitimize it)
- Imitate someone else’s process (“ “)
- Imitate someone else’s material without refraction and questioning
- Limit a work or genre to the normal limits imposed on it
- Limit the inputs of a work or genre to its own kind (versus the entire world being the input)
- Work in detail without considering the whole (the whole anchors the detail)
- Accept a solution as “good enough”
- Continue to accept the limits of a genre or style they find restrictive
- Try to gloss over inconsistencies, paradoxes and contradictions - instead leave as is
- Genius isn’t limited by the capacities of their audience, or the principles that supposedly make up “good” art

How could talent not do something genius could? Vision - that talent could do it but can’t conceptualize it.
 Because talent/artisanship can create anything - but not the initial idea and not the new method itself.
 i.e. given the instructions & method, anyone with the appropriate aptitude could do anything
 Genius is how the simple is able to be restored after a level of complexity has been achieved -
 The genius has the vision to ‘wipe the slate clean’ and start from fresh assumptions.

MIT’s learning environment:

- “Private research university”
- Interdisciplinary centers, labs
- Ties with independent research organizations
- Cross-registration program w/ other schools (Cambridge, etc.)

GENIUS TASKS

compile from Chronicles, I.O. philo, identity doc, genius doc, lives of great geniuses, savants, higher solution, principles doc, etc.
 genius is measured by achievements and goals of the genius
 how much is dependent on action in "real world"? (write after each one)

Generalization/New Style significance:

NS: the highest goals of NS reifications

Generalization:

Highest achievements, indicative of genius, in human context

All genius tasks

All "traits of God" - past human ability Omniscience Generalization of each "trait of God" toward perfect incarnation

"First man on earth" thought experiment - "perfect" anticipatory genius (generalized to all possible outcomes of initial conditions)

Genius task vs. time/context = perfect timing (connectivity/butterfly effect in perfect balance)

+ negative generalization: no...universal genius:

1st: "**traits of God**" - many are so obviously impossible they aren't even admitted in criteria for human genius (is this wrong or right?)

What are the positive and negative manifestations of "traits of God" in a human being?

Some traits of human genius aren't associated with God (the Dionysian, the right of rejection, full esotericism)

Write God > human analogues - how humans can reflect these ideal traits (albeit at a more modest level)

Generalize problems, knowledge and foresight of all problems

First/only man on earth = ultimate genius task

Omniscience would imply foreseeing/knowing all human ideas/concepts/opinions as well as all "objective truths"

"Avoidance of non-genius task" as the first genius task (as many as possible) + delegation, etc.

Genius takes on, and completes with mastery, audacious tasks:

Mann writing arguments between geniuses

Hawking summarizing an entire body of knowledge

Rosen summarizing and analyzing an entire style

Michelangelo's Sistine, summarizing and exalting the most famous story in history

Bernini doing St. Peter's

Bach/Penderecki masses

CS Lewis explaining the strategies of the Devil

Lord of the Rings = invented world and language

Preparatory genius:

Arrive at a situation that allows/provides for/nourishes genius. Implication: there are situations that threaten/stifle genius.

Gaining access to resources (Alexander the Great)

Putting yourself in an optimum position to influence (Lincoln)

Historic opportunities

Attain totalizing scope:

Almost guarantees visionary predictions to some degree (Kurzweil), if you saturate yourself enough with current innovations, broad knowledge and awareness of history in the long sense. You could probably generalize the future based on the past and achieve general success.

Implication: there are situations that threaten/stifle genius.

Maximization of genius/achievement given limited resources (time, windows of opportunity)

"the greatest enemy of genius is limitation by time/finite time"

Continue upward trajectory for entire life (vs. certain geniuses who "burned out" or "peaked")

Cope with full knowledge of negative absolutes - maintain creativity after mortality salience

Solve the world's problems

Recognize problems where others don't see them (universalized "problem orientation")

Solve "open" problems of disciplines

Invent genius solutions for average/common problems, esp. those that are accepted by humanity ("timeless" problems)

Universality of invention/idea, by % of the population affected (Facebook, computers, electricity, medicine, human language)

Create something that transcends your individual life

System or organization Generational____

Found and grow a large company or institution

Design the type of interrelated system that only complex interaction/problem solving over many years can create

(Manhattan, the internet, global financial markets, the brain/human body)

Being able to conceive of it - all contingencies, anticipated problems = deep foresight

Thousands of systems working together

Draw finer distinctions and explaining them logically (Sartre, philosophers, scientists)

Create new disciplines (gateway theory)

Implication: if your work doesn't fit into current category, create a new discipline for it
 Develop the new discipline enough for it to be clearly defined and *extended by others*

Utilize a body of theory for the largest, most extreme implications (Einstein and Newton, "extreme" physics)

Discern the truth of cutting edge research

Discern the potential of cutting edge, even future ideas/research/tech
 then realize this potential in reality

Extend knowledge of the unseen/abstract/intangible *with certainty* (mathematicians, theoretical/quantum/astrophysicists)
 discovering an "invisible" force that has universal impact (physics, psychology, etc.)

Formalize the informal

Write the definitive summary of a body of knowledge

Make a "comprehensive" work on a subject, synthesizing all available knowledge on a subject + original research
 Creating a taxonomy or organization-model used by subsequent generations in the field

Teach or anthologize masterfully (demands you understand and assimilate more, generalization)

Potential/comprehensiveness, vs. creation which is particularized, creation of theories and ways of thought
 The power of literary description

Demands you understand and assimilate more, generalization

Potential/comprehensiveness vs. creation which is particularized), creation of theories and ways of thought)

Consolidation

Summarization

Definitive analytical biography of a great, or underappreciated great

Publish credible writing on all topics

Be able to speak on any topic

Know all the languages (approximately 200) of the world, and translate among them instantly (Sidas)

Creating a functional verbal language (refracting the entire body of knowledge through different mind)

Would have to be combinatory, because you wouldn't have the time to refract every existing word/term
 esp. if it came into widespread use

(This usually is a complex process undertaken by an entire population over many centuries)

Create an iconic image that resonates for centuries (Da Vinci's Mona Lisa)

Involves highest level of technical mastery in execution, but conceptualizing is the true key here

Create a concept that sweeps through a discipline or across disciplines (Freud, scientific method)

a concept that all disciplines must incorporate

Dramatic writing:

Writing a drama involving geniuses (Mann) - requires you at least be at their level

Historic fiction Hard science fiction

Comedy:

Plot machinations Interwoven

Aphorisms and witticisms

Developing an aspect of oneself to a "superhuman" degree (memory, etc.)

Saying something complex in a simple poetic way ("the only way", the 'perfect' solution) (Shakespeare, Mozart)

GENIUS PROCESS

(intertwined with 'Genius Tasks')

Generalization/New Style significance:

All steps leading to/contributing to a genius result, in all possible orders Optimized: highest genius result
 All genius action (see genius task)
 + Negative generalization: no...

Developing processes, conversion of 'genius properties' into functional steps

Unique methods often lead to unique results: if your method seems conventional, you should explore further
 process innovation
 ostentatious idea brainstorming
 productivity: getting more done in less time (toward the ideal point where all is done instantaneously)
 Da Vinci: "consider first the end" - the end product, work from the desired result "what it took to..." ('What It Took' analyses)
 Creative chaos
 Ostentatious idea lists - in every aspect of life

Planning and foresight

Various simulations, worked all the way through, used as models
 TO-DO lists, combined with freedom and flexibility
 Prioritization = important - give reasons, etc. (in light of opportunity cost of time)

Expectation:

Setting higher expectations = higher performance Expectations become self-fulfilling prophecies
 "The danger is not setting our aim too high and falling short; but in setting our aim too low and achieving our mark" - Michelangelo

Knowledge accumulation

Warning: "prior knowledge can hinder problem solving"

knowing and not knowing simultaneously (maintaining "childlike" ability to question)

Study disciplines necessary to your work, as the need presents itself

Edison: "read the library" = 120-hour weeks (17-18 hour days, 7 days a week)

"if you can't stand something, immerse yourself in it"

"Invention is dependent on a total accumulation of knowledge, including that which seems forgotten." - Edison

Chess masters: 50,000 moves

Finding highest sources of knowledge - source texts, etc. (and the physical, tangible)

Learn the technical language of disciplines ASAP (notation, etc.)

Engage many ways of learning, integrate them (all senses/both hemispheres, experience, teaching etc.) Grow new neurons, paths

Lifetime learning - b/c much of what we learn now will be obsolete (jobs, textbook material etc.)

Eventually, your knowledge aggregates and becomes like a "sixth sense"

'Growth and learning are never linear' - 'higher solution', etc.

"the greater the turbulence the more complex the solution, the greater the jump to a higher order".

Darwin "hit a wall" - but finally had the realization that was expressed in Origin of the Species

"quantum leaps after stagnation" - fallow periods, etc.

Leaps: making leaps toward goal, often unforeseen

Neurogenesis: brain's creation of new neurons - and all of our cells are replaced every 3 to 6 months

= neuroplasticity: reinforcement is key, focus highly on the new behaviors - participation creates more neurons than watching

extreme anticipatory learning "anticipatory genius" form a giant anticipatory mass

anticipatory creation: A process-technique of conceptualizing a set of ideals (artistically or otherwise) that one isn't able to "live up to" yet - then spends time "catching up" to them - sometimes an entire lifetime. This is an analogy to anticipatory learning, where you see a phenomenon or encounter information you don't yet understand, but somehow that encounter drives you (both consciously and unconsciously) toward the attainment of understanding. Many of my most memorable moments have come from being completely shocked upon first discovering someone's music or art - Beethoven's Diabelli and Hammerklavier, Strauss's Salome, Joyce's Ulysses and Wake, most of Sondheim, and many visual artists. Probably the quickest way to learn is to encounter something so incomprehensible that you know you need to fundamentally evolve.

My own Principles, 100 Problems and Genius documents function in that manner for my own projects, NS and Opus 1 - all three still state certain ideals that I'm not sure are possible for any human to live up to, and the "traits of God" list in 'Genius' was deliberately created to provoke me into greater New Style invention.

Polemically, bad art lies to the audience about how great (and difficult) art can be, as a bad educational system obscures how difficult subjects really are, depriving students of both this anticipatory shock and the faith that they can eventually assimilate it into their mind.

Modeling: Watch others who are better than you, continuously search for higher benchmarks

Benchmark thought process, not actual techniques

Barriers: 1st, examine the barriers of what can be possible (physics, etc.)

Not much is truly impossible - a lot is improbable (but not impossible), but don't focus on the possible, focus on the *impossible*

'Problem search' phase - both familiar but unsolvable and unfamiliar/undiscovered ones

Problem list/investigation/questions: "Always judge a man by his questions, not his answers" - Voltaire

Within discipline or totalized

Writing criticisms reflective of unease with current status of certain issues

'sensitive unease' = greater distinctions

List all the problems and barriers explicitly, to deal with them

Become solution-focused, not problem-focused (in the past, you've been problem-focused)

Once you acknowledge a problem, you can work to solve it - if you don't acknowledge it, it will continue to impede you

Applying imagination to problems

Childlike reductions: the ability to see things purely, as a child, asking basic questions (that would seem crazy to an adult)

Imagination:

"The gift of fantasy has meant more to me than absorption of positive knowledge"

Imagination is outside reality¹, therefore it is on the "unlimited side", vs. knowledge on the "limited side" - they are 2 different species

Prediction/implication phase

Work:

"No labor is capable of tiring me" - Da Vinci

Conversion of imagination, via work + will, into reality/existence: "once you see the vision, you must deal with it rationally"

Experience accumulation

Experimentation:

Is about finding the barriers, making mistakes

Mistake: admit, identify mistakes, don't deny them

(3M - wanted workers to have 60%+ failure rates)

Allot more time for undirected thought (or direct it w/ I.O.)

Invention as "serendipitous game" - luck, tinkering etc.

"I have learned chiefly through mistakes and the pursuit of false assumptions" - Stravinsky

Perseverance:

You "never lose, you simply may run out of time"

"In the long-run, no costs are fixed" (there is the ability & time to change)

"Obsessive is good" - but watch "workaholism" - always be looking for ways to make work more efficient.

Working on many projects at once = using innovations/discoveries in one on another

"concurrent development"

Sacrifice: "a measure of your passion for your dream"

Concentration on difference, not excellence, if the goal is to change (i.e. change must be the *first* priority, esp. to the leaders)

Hypothetically, a significant contribution to every area of interest philosophy or writing on every area

Joining or assembling a team, institution, organization

"Genius Tasks/Forms": some forms allow for expression of genius better than others

Small: one right decision

Large: pluralistic invention, anthological ambition, etc.

Genius must be deliberately directed towards the highest aims, or it will be squandered

...and because a lifetime is fixed, the more time spent in the higher domain, the better.

"Know what to overlook"

Create the largest possible system to think in

"Learn what problems are worth solving"

Revision:

"Genius Complexity Standards" - based on objective, in light of full spectrum

'Formalizing' phase

Enough 'meat', translation and organization to allow others to continue/build on it (Aristotle as "the father" of certain disciplines)

Necessitates judgment of what should be formalized and how

Named thought experiments

Gateway theory: nomenclature creates the ability to tangibly reference and build

Debut/Publishing (see: formalizing)

Popularization (optional):

Layman interaction: how do they deal with others? The 'most productive' way?

"You have to know how accept rejection and reject acceptance"

For a radically new product, the answer to "is there a market?" is always initially "no"

Build: "it is important to find new worlds to conquer"

Searching for a new problem or development of past work to greater detail?

Develop the vision in progressively greater detail

Option: start something, then turn it over to someone else to run it (in business)

Creative destruction: give up “what is” to attain “what could be” - old mental maps, visual archetypes/visions of future

Innovation means “creative destruction”

Behavior “burns new paths” in the brain - but you need to *define* the new behavior to practice it (if it isn’t, you’ll fall back on habits)

Trick yourself into innovative habits - saturate the brain with the desired experiences (and ban the old)

Mental images that you always think about = develop the images you want to act out in real life

“divine visualization”

The brain changes in response to experience = neuroplasticity

The past often holds you back - objects/possessions, methods, obligations, people

Kill off the present for a better future = and good is the enemy of great = kill current “ideal” for a higher one

Many geniuses were incompetent at/failed at in an early goal/dream, only to find a higher purpose

“If you desire to be special, you can’t keep acting normal”

Picasso: “art destroys the subject and gives it another life”

Do symbolic things to start ‘new periods’ in life

Love change, not any *thing* (kill object-based sentimentality)

There is a high price for progress - with every gain, something is lost

(the sacrifices entrepreneurs have made to start their businesses are often staggering and insane)

Writing/communication:

Style guidelines can inhibit/limit how academia presents its ideas (using illustrations, etc.)

= Regimentation without (a good enough) reason

Iconography is the fastest way to communicate an idea - symbols (like the holistic objects of the new style?)

Cerebral centering = balance words with a visual

Icon shouldn’t imply superficiality - can be very profound/complex

Don’t expect/demand clarity

“The metaphor is the mask of God” - i.e. the fixed and knowable, rules, etc. aren’t the highest domain

see: ambiguity theory

Blend the big picture (“gestalt”) with detail, integrate them.

“Think in systems, never pieces”

“Attack fear”

JOYCE:

Joyce as the inverse of Wittgenstein - whereas Witt considers language imperfect and inexact enough to warrant "saying nothing" as an ideal, Joyce uses language to the highest level of complexity and potential of use.

"What you would have to know" to write like Joyce *theoretically* extends to comprehensive understanding of everything - language, vocabulary, history, politics, literature, mythology, religion, psychology, culture, vocabulary, humor, form, even the hard sciences - even if he just mentions or utilizes them for a moment (sentence or less) in a 700-page work.

The way Joyce writes doesn't correspond to the way anyone normally speaks, so the intuitive connection between speech and writing is severed. One usually writes in a similar style to the way one speaks - so an implication of Joyce is essentially re-learning how to speak. But since speech is informed (and formed) by thought, one must also learn how to think in a new way - a hyperactive, omniscient, playfully brilliant manner of thought, but counterintuitively veiled - with a level of indirectness that interrupts the normal objective of thought and speech = to be direct and concise.

Esotericism is perhaps the highest goal - we are wired to understand things that are almost entirely and deliberately accessible - common vocabularies, domains/subjects/disciplines - even professionals and academics share common knowledge within their field. Creating something that is only understandable to you is an almost impossible achievement - it combines the new and the cryptic, which you aren't even wired to understand easily. Paradoxically, the creation of esotericism depends on your being able to understand something you're not "wired" to understand, yet you have to understand it in order to create it. Is it genius that breaks this paradox?

Joyce exposes the "**poverty of directness**".

The more Joycean qualities the new style/POTU(M) has, the better

Joycean qualities into theoretical description?

Hints at "**thought languages**" and language creation in general

Because thought precedes speech and writing

The explanation that Joyce's thought is in an "alternate world"

Esotericism conceptualized as "coming from another world" (at least in its ideal form)

What isn't he doing? i.e. are there ways he's restraining himself from techniques that would lead to negative results?