VoyeurOne Baron: I thought it might be useful to draw upon some of the points discussed last week as well as some of the things raised on the wiki already. Last week some of the issues raised had to do with the possibilities for autonomy within different types of code (programmed code, biological/physical, and social...like law). At the end of last week’s meeting Gonta was talking about the notion of singularity (introduced by Ray Kurzweil): how all technological progress has moved towards global unification. One point that I thought of in relation to the ISBN-JPEG project (which has been submitted to the flack attack wiki) is how technical unification/singularity can be experienced as control.

jesz Murakami: Actually singularity is probably deeper than global, and techno just a booster.

Sorgaard Jacques: Which leads to the question again on the Second Life example...autonomy within code.

VoyeurOne Baron: Another thing that’s up on the wiki is the differences between the autonomy-identity constellations in different cultures.

jesz Murakami: Or are we considering it in a context of interdependency. Can u really separate autonomy from context.

MichaelJohn Turner: I dont think so.

jesz Murakami: I agree. Though many try playing out the illusion of ‘independence’.

Sorgaard Jacques: Well, any context also houses a topography. Which leads to the question of hierarchies... Autonomy within hierarchy.

jesz Murakami: Or...holography; each equal to the whole.

Sorgaard Jacques: So you could see the context as an autonomous object then?
Michael John Turner: the whole as autonomous?

Søgaard Jacques: This is a problem Deleuze dwelled into a lot...

Jesz Murakami: Like the cells--organs---body---who is autonomous?

Søgaard Jacques: Matrix transformations

Søgaard Jacques: And Deleuze again: “The body without organs”

Michael John Turner: Language, form, sets something apart, as semi-autonomous?

Søgaard Jacques: Agreed Michael John

Jesz Murakami: Another problem with autonomy is object vs action

Michael John Turner: As a product of interdependencies?

Søgaard Jacques: Gwyn...you have written something quite concrete about Second Life and the removal of the telehubs? Right

Gwyneth Llewelyn: Yes :) Should I elaborate? lol

Søgaard Jacques: Yes!!!

Gwyneth Llewelyn: Ok, there is a certain assumption about “virtual realities”... You can have topology following topography, which is familiar to us human beings, i.e. if my house is here, and yours is over the street, crossing the street will get you there. All familiar concepts. Now, if you have point-to-point teleport all points are equally distant. So, the topology is completely “detached” from topography. Some would say this is a “good thing” since we can experiment with it in Second Life. Never in Real Life. Some (among them my person, lol) prefer to have a “virtual reality” with which they can relate a bit more to. I mean... our avatars are “mostly humanoid” although we can be quite different shapes. Most people build houses on the ground (with some exceptions). We have gravity, although we fly... etc and so on — you see my point. If the world were utterly surreal, it would only appeal to a certain group. Point-to-point will give us a grid-wide surrealism. I’m not sure if that is a Good Thing.

Voyeur One Baron: What you are saying is that it is important to have common references

Gwyneth Llewelyn: Yes. common references. Well it's important, it may not be CRUCIAL... *shrugs*... I’d say, most likely we’ll have a “hybrid” grid — one where most people will “block” point-to-point teleport in order to be able to build communities by physical proximity. And others will experiment with unbounded “proximity”

Michael John Turner: I agree in the sense that I like the references for a sense of meaning towards my own ‘real life’

Søgaard Jacques: That is interesting also in a wider context (non Second Life) how common references both bind us and free us

Gwyneth Llewelyn: Hmm — let’s say, I prefer a “realistic” environment with a fantastic element, as opposed to a surrealistic environment.

Xantha Oe: Exactly, one great attribute of an environment like Second Life is to experiment with surrealism, fantasticism and other aspects

Michael John Turner: What draws most if not all to second life is the stretching of real life we can do here I would say

Xantha Oe: At State of Play (and likely in blog comments) several pointed out how disappointing close to reality much of the Second Life architecture is

Gwyneth Llewelyn: Yes :)

Bix Stravinsky: That’s to be expected as most people like verisimilitude

Søgaard Jacques: Point-to-point is more utilizing the environment. Conceptually it is the way forward. But at the same time one could argue that we should get rid of all common references... leaving a wasteland

Jesz Murakami: For me the ‘real’ interest in Second Life is experimenting in new societal systems

Gwyneth Llewelyn: hehe jesz — have you started doing that? I mean, it’s harder than it looks.

Bix Stravinsky: indeed

Gwyneth Llewelyn: It’s *much easier* if you start from a ‘familiar’ approach.

Bix Stravinsky: People will always adopt familiar approach first. Until they see how much the community allows. Just like high school.

Gwyneth Llewelyn: haha

Michael John Turner: Familiar is a strategy for me as an artist

Bix Stravinsky: Yes familiar is a good start, but twisted familiar is better :)

Voyeur One Baron: I would be interested to hear from you Tab. You are a first life Architect... right?

Tab Scott: Yes. My initial interest in Second Life was to see how it could be used as a tool to supplement design of buildings in Real Life. It will be good for that. But there is an entire Second Life culture and architecture that allows for other possibilities.

Michael John Turner: If you want to communicate

Søgaard Jacques: Right Tab

Bix Stravinsky: Regarding architecture, unfortunately
Second Life does not have rules of physics for buildings. So really only useful conceptually.

Tab Scott: There is a class studying the Physics of Second Life now. There is some physics.

Bix Stravinsky: Part of the act of architecture is the implementing in Real Life.

VoyeurOne Baron: But then we are just into Second Life as a model... Second Life is also a place in itself.

Gwyneth Llewelyn: You can only hope that with the new renderer (2006...? 2007...?) and the improved physics system you’d be able to build “physical-enabled” buildings.

AngryBeth Shortbread: I tried to make a tower of physical bricks - it shook itself to bits, without even having to touch it.

Tab Scott: We experimented with turning physics on objects and building a Roman arch with a keystone.

Bix Stravinsky: And did the keystone perform?

Tab Scott: The keystone kept popping up out of the structure.

Bix Stravinsky: haha. Well at least there WAS a reaction. Laws of physics are just different here.

Tab Scott: Yes, lol. Gets back to some of the basic programming of Second Life and objects.

Sorgaard Jacques: Anyway I think your take on the telehubs could make for an article on flackattack Gwyneth?

MichaelJohn Turner: autonomy and meaning gwyn?

VoyeurOne Baron: yes... do submit it Gwyn

Gwyneth Llewelyn: lol well, sure...

Sorgaard Jacques: But you can apply the ideas behind point-to-point telehub transportation on Autonomy in connection to Body or physical limits or possibilities in Second life and so forth.

MichaelJohn Turner: I might be writing about that (too)... autonomy and meaning.

Gwyneth Llewelyn: I’m not sure if I have enough knowledge to do such a deep analysis, lol... Well, you’ll be able to review it :)

Sorgaard Jacques: TRUST THE WIKI...lol

Gwyneth Llewelyn: haha yes!

MichaelJohn Turner: right! I saw a wikipedia article today with the heading : this article needs an expert lol

Bix Stravinsky: can i get a brief review of the autonomy and meaning thread?

VoyeurOne Baron: I think it has to do with to what extent we need shared references to create meaning. And how that relates to autonomy, Bix.

Bix Stravinsky: ahh, yeah shared references - I want to say yes, but I really want to say no. We assume alot of shared references, but ignore cultural differences often.

VoyeurOne Baron: true bix

MichaelJohn Turner: Yes there are so many assumptions here :)

Bix Stravinsky: Oddly, because Second Life is programmed, framework here is strangely shared... x=1 y=2 etc... there is only one interpretation, as far as the mechanics of Second Life are concerned.

VoyeurOne Baron: Common server and protocol.

Bix Stravinsky: However we disembodied souls still can misunderstand each other.

Sorgaard Jacques: AngryBeth you mentioned images... THAT WOULD BE GREAT.

AngryBeth Shortbread: I’m not sure if my idea fits in neatly with what’s up at the moment.

MichaelJohn Turner: good

Sorgaard Jacques: I see...but maybe you inspire in new ways AngryBeth.

AngryBeth Shortbread: I was playing with the notion of how people relate to reproducing an object made by someone else – going back to the chinese whispers ideas ages ago.

Sorgaard Jacques: I like

VoyeurOne Baron: mmmm... the chinese whisper is nice AngryBeth....

jesz Murakami: What if they whisper out loud?

MichaelJohn Turner: Is that what memes are about beth?

jesz Murakami: And keep the meaning. And even deepen it.

AngryBeth Shortbread: I tried a sandbox experiment. Made a utah teapot with a square next to it, saying “make a copy of this”. Hey presto a teacup - (which I was expecting) – or some riff on jamming it. But only had 10 mins to try that out – so going to leave it up for a few days – see what happens.

Gwyneth Llewelyn: :)”

AngryBeth Shortbread: So anyway – what I would end up with is loads of photos – of various attempts / subversions and generations of copies of the original.

Sorgaard Jacques: Great. Greatness.