

edewlogics

ade ronke

intellect, being and quotient

© edewlogics, all rights reserved

### Author's Note

The work as well as others like it can be found among others in the essay section of my website available free, [www.edewlogics.com](http://www.edewlogics.com). To support free works like this and others available on my site, please support the free books for life cause. Thank you.

### BOOK SCHEDULED TO BE PUBLISHED THIS YEAR



*Five people are dead in the swimming pool of a high end resort hotel. Only one of them, a fame-hungry politician, is the suspected target. Three people are dead at a roof party on a high rise luxury building. The target is unidentifiable. The killer's calling card is a single black point on a blank. Lila Orileda is hired to find out who killed one of the random targets as the police run out of viable clues and suspects.*

[A Case in Point Excerpt](#)



*The unexpected preemptive leap differential machine error, the Knapse, triggers the co-embedded synaptic alarm in its designer Patrick Tinsel towards the chaos associated with it. He must correct the sociopolitical cost or enable its realizations.*

### [DONATE TO SUPPORT THE FREE BOOKS FOR LIFE CAUSE](#)

You may choose to donate whatever you may through [lomopeju@protonmail.com](mailto:lomopeju@protonmail.com) paypal handle. And you may put your support into the love and enjoyment of music at [rillmusic on Bandcamp](#). Thank you.

## Intellect, being and quotient

Intellect is a subjective element. It is objectively perceived. If you look around you, You realize IQ is not a real representation of intelligence. It is rather one of expected symbolic intelligence—typified expectation, rather than an embodying one—the typification that comes from a sourced individualized abstraction. A lot of people have a higher IQ than Einstein. His fame was not presupposed by the attribution of his intellect.

By symbolic in the definition, I mean that the quotient is known or knowable rather than distinctly implicitly subjective. And thorough practice of the acumen of such expectations can easily beat it.  $12$  divided by  $4$  is  $3$ . And you can simply commit that to memory symbolically. You can also have a symbolic method with which to recover in case you forget. You can draw  $12$  sticks and cross them out four at a time to count the number of symbolic representations.

$16$  divided by  $4$  is  $4$ . That can be represented symbolically. The same  $16$  divided by  $3$  is  $5.3333333333333333...$  and the  $3$  is infinitesimally repetitive in the decimal mode. This cannot be represented symbolically. The same  $16$  divided by  $5$  is  $3.2$ . But it cannot be said to be a simple  $3.2$ . Because it cannot be represented symbolically.

Take this for a sarcastic gesture on subjects to be discussed in the future—decimals—I've got to love them.

Intellect is a subjective element. Intelligence is made formative outside the norms of expectation. Nature answers to the narrative of a present and conditioned faculty in the embodying individual. It is often argued that collective intelligence is empowering. My

perspective on the subject is simple and should be simply understood. Collective intelligence is empowering in as much as it is stupefying. Its empowerment and stupefiedness are intertwined exponentially with great stupefaction. Unlike in the individual.

Collective narratives of intelligence have been the bases of great evil, harm, war, destruction and crimes against humanity. Why are there catastrophic applications for something if its appearance is simply symbolically represented? It must be a cautionary tale—especially in an age where modern artificial intelligence systems are going to absorb collective intelligence. Must we not awe at the machines and strive for individualized self-optimizable human intelligence? Or adapt by adopting a self-morphological representation of intelligence and its derivable quotients?

Unlike individual intelligence humanized to potent optimization, collective intelligence has been a source of great and grave ill in socio-political institutions.

Quotients do not derive intelligence. Intelligence derives quotients. Natural intelligence derives being. Being is derived in individualized capacity because distinctions of intellection cannot be found or formed in the collective. Therefore collective intelligence is a nullification of being, which in turn nullifies the necessary abstraction it embodies.

### **Author's Note**

It is important to me that you support the free books for life cause or give your support through music by ril. Please do so if you can afford to do so. Thank you.

[\*\*DONATE TO SUPPORT THE FREE BOOKS FOR LIFE CAUSE\*\*](#)

You may choose to donate whatever you may through [lomopeju@protonmail.com](mailto:lomopeju@protonmail.com) paypal handle. And you may put your support into the love and enjoyment of music at [rillmusic on Bandcamp](#). Thank you.