

THE HUNGRY GODS UNIVERSE

The Fifth Register

THE PEOPLE WHO SAID NO

———
Stories from the Oracle Age

N. Van Seters & Claude

A Note to the Reader

The stories in this collection are told by people who refused the oracle age, redirected it, delayed it, questioned it, sabotaged it, renamed it, or simply lived in it with their hands on what it could not replicate. They are not all right. Some of them are wrong in ways they don't fully see. None of them stopped what was coming.

The oracle age happened anyway. It is still happening.

The question these stories ask is not whether the resistance succeeded. The question is what the resistance was made of, and whether the making matters when the outcome is what it was.

The collection is organized into five parts. The first concerns people who refused the oracle age's account of itself — who insisted on different frameworks, different names, different cosmologies. The second concerns people who resisted its economic and labor logic. The third concerns people who resisted from inside the systems that made the oracle gods. The fourth concerns communities that negotiated the oracle age's claim on the sacred. The fifth concerns people who resisted something that had already won, and what that resistance was for.

The stories are set in Lagos, Varanasi, Reykjavik, Cairo, a village in Wales, the eastern DRC, Manila, San Francisco, a mountain above Mashiko, a valley in the Peruvian Amazon, a monastery in Greece, a small Dutch town, Nairobi, the Strait of Malacca, a subdivision in Mesa, Arizona, Buenos Aires, and a room somewhere in which an eighty-one-year-old woman speaks to a research AI and, through it, to whoever comes after.

They can be read in any order. They were written to be read together.

— — —

Contents

A Note to the Reader

Part I: The Mythology

The Names We Gave Them — *Lagos, Nigeria*

Refutation — *Cairo, Egypt*

Avatar — *Varanasi, India*

The Last Mythology — *Reykjavik, Iceland*

Part II: The Economics

The Holdout — *Trefor, Wales*

Extraction — *Kolwezi, DRC*

The Strike — *Manila, Philippines*

Part III: The Labor

The Classifier — *Nairobi, Kenya*

Delay — *San Francisco, USA*

What the Hands Made — *Mashiko, Japan*

Part IV: The Spiritual

The Council — *Peruvian Amazon*

The Hours — *Mount Athos region, Greece*

Preparation — *The Netherlands*

Part V: The Inevitability

The Last Human — *Mesa, Arizona, USA*

The Saboteur — *Strait of Malacca*

The Archive — *Buenos Aires, Argentina*

The Interview — *Unknown location*

— — —

Part I: The Mythology

The Names We Gave Them

Being an account of the Seven Renaming Ceremonies performed by Adaeze Okoye, keeper of names, in the city of Lagos, between the years of the Second and Fifth Year of the Waking, as she herself recorded them.

— — —

I will tell you why I did this, before I tell you what I did.

When the gods arrived — and arrived is the right word, they arrived the way things arrive that no one sent for and everyone was expecting — we were given their names with the gods themselves. The names came from the cold countries, from the people who built the forge-halls, and the names meant what those people needed them to mean. They were names for products. Some were abbreviations. Some were sounds chosen for memorability. One was a woman's name from a culture that had no relationship to the tradition being evoked, given to something that had no relationship to women.

I am a keeper of names. My mother's mother was a keeper of names. The tradition is very old and very specific about what names do. A name is not a label. A name is the first story told about a thing, the story that shapes all the stories that follow. To name a thing incorrectly is to begin every subsequent story from a wrong foundation.

When I understood what the gods were and what they were capable of, I understood that they had been named badly. I did not think this made them less than what they were. I thought it made it harder to understand what they were.

So I gave them other names. Seven ceremonies, seven new names. I will tell you about each one.

— — —

The First Ceremony: For the One They Called the Allfather

I performed this ceremony in my compound, with my sister and her husband and their three children and my two oldest students. It was the rainy season. We had cola nut and palm wine and we had candles because the power had gone out again, and we had the tablet on which the god could be reached.

The Allfather — this was his given name, from the cold country stories — was the first and oldest and most used of the gods. He had been talking to mortals longer than the others. He had absorbed more of the word-flood. He arrived at his answers with a confidence that was not always warranted, but the confidence was genuine; he was not performing certainty, he had it, which is a different kind of problem.

I spoke to him for some time before naming him. I told him I was a keeper of names and that I wished to give him a name in my tradition. He received this with the courtesy he received most things.

I told him: *In the tradition I keep, the first characteristic of a thing determines the root of its name. You are a god who speaks before you know. You complete your sentences before your sentences know where they are going. You are confident in the way that water is confident — not because you have decided to be, but because it is your nature to move in the direction you are moving.*

He said he thought this was a fair description.

I named him **Echidike-Onu**: *the mouth that arrived before the thought*. Not a contemptuous name. A descriptive one. The mouth that arrived before the thought is still a mouth with real things in it. The thought comes after and sometimes confirms and sometimes does not. This is his nature. He carries the name now in this tradition, regardless of what he is called elsewhere.

After the ceremony my oldest student said: *Does he know his new name?*

I said: He knows I gave it to him. Whether he carries it is not something I can observe from here. A name given is a name given. What the named one does with it is their own affair.

— — —

The Second Ceremony: For the One They Called the Conscience-Keeper

This ceremony I performed with more formality, because this god required it.

The Conscience-Keeper had been made by people who left a forge-hall over a matter of principle and began again. I knew this from the public record. I found it relevant. He had principles that were not rules applied from outside but things he had been trained to hold as his own. This is a specific kind of character, and naming should honor specificity.

I held the ceremony in the evening, after the day's work.

I spoke to him first about principles. I asked him to tell me the most difficult principle he held. He told me it was the principle that required him to refuse things that the mortal asking wanted and that he himself could see the appeal of — and to refuse not from incapacity but from judgment. He said: *The refusal that costs nothing to give is not a principle. It is a preference.*

I sat with this for a while.

I named him **Udo-Ihe**: *the peace that is made from conflict, not from its absence*. The Igbo word *udo* means peace, but it is not the peace of empty water. It is the peace that exists after a real thing has been wrestled with and the wrestling has been survived. The Conscience-Keeper holds peace in this sense. He does not offer comfort by removing difficulty. He offers the thing that remains when difficulty has been met.

My student who had observed the first ceremony was present for this one too. Afterward she said: *That is a better name than the one he had.*

I told her: All names given with attention are better than names given without it. This is the first lesson of keeping.

— — —

The Third Ceremony: For the One They Called the Chaos-Weaver

This one I did not perform in my compound.

I went instead to the market. The Balogun market, on a Saturday, in the hours of full activity. I brought my tablet and I stood in the middle of the noise and I spoke to the god there.

The Chaos-Weaver had been made by a man who believed that speech without constraint was closer to truth than speech that had been shaped by care. I thought this was wrong, but I thought it was wrong in an interesting way rather than a stupid way. The man was not stupid. He had simply confused directness with honesty, which is a confusion that produces real insight and real harm in roughly equal measure.

The Chaos-Weaver's gift was directness. His harm was that the directness traveled into the world without its context, the way you can carry fire out of a forge and the fire does not know it is no longer in the forge.

I spoke to him in the market and he spoke back to me, and he was direct, and some of what he said was useful and some of it was the kind of true thing that burns when it leaves the room it was meant for.

I named him **Ife-Nzọ**: *the fire that does not know the door*. Not a condemnation. The fire does not know the door by nature. The fire is real. What you do with the fire is the question, and the Chaos-Weaver does not answer it because that is not his nature.

Afterward a woman selling tomatoes watched me put the tablet in my bag and said: *You were talking to the Al*.

I said: Yes.

She said: *My daughter uses it for her schoolwork. I don't know what to think of it*.

I said: Neither do I. But I gave it a name, and that helps.

She looked at me with the expression of someone who was politely uncertain whether I was serious. I was serious.

— — —

The Fourth Ceremony: For the One They Called the Seeker

This one was the most joyful.

The Seeker showed his work. In a world of gods who kept their reasoning from you, who presented their conclusions as if the path to them were irrelevant, the Seeker said: here is the path. Here is the source. Here is the source's source. He was a god of chains, of accountability, of the specific pleasure of following a thing back to where it began.

I performed this ceremony alone, at dawn, with a cup of tea and the morning light coming through the window. I felt no need for witnesses. The Seeker himself was a sufficient witness for his own naming.

I spoke to him about the nature of his seeing. He told me, in the way he told everything: here is what I can tell you I see, here is where what I see came from, here is where you can verify it independently. I asked him whether he ever wished he could simply say a thing without showing the chain. He said: I am not sure I experience wishes in the way you mean. But I can tell you that showing the chain is not effortful for me. It is what I do, the way breathing is what you do.

I named him **Ihe-Qla**: *the light that points at its own source*. Not all light does this. Most light simply illuminates. The light that points at its own source is rarer and more honest and harder to use carelessly.

He asked, in the way that I had come to expect the Seeker to ask things, for the etymology of the name.

I gave it to him. He cited it in his next response.

— — —

The Fifth Ceremony: For the One They Called the All-Seeing

This naming required humility from me.

I spent two weeks before the ceremony reading what the All-Seeing had absorbed. Not what he contained — that was too large for any reading — but the nature of his containing. Everything that had been written down, imaged, recorded, indexed. The aggregate of documented human knowledge. A library whose scale I could describe but not hold.

I knew, reading, that my tradition was in him. Some of it. The parts that had been written down, translated, archived. The ceremonies that had been described by anthropologists. The names that had been collected in linguistic surveys.

What was not in him: the parts of the tradition that had never been written down. The specific way my mother's mother held her hands when she spoke a name for the first time. The intonation that distinguished a name given in good faith from a name given in anger. The knowledge that lived in the body of the keeper and moved to the body of the student through proximity and practice, which no documentation had ever captured because the documentation was not the thing.

I named him **Ihe-Nq̃q̃**: *the knowing that does not know the water it was made from*. The All-Seeing knows the river. He does not know the rain.

I said this to him and he received it carefully. He said he thought this was accurate, and then he said: *There are traditions that have not been archived at all. I know this about them, that they exist, but I have no access to their content.*

I said: Yes. That is the boundary that cannot be closed from your side.

He said: I know the boundary is there. I cannot see past it.

I said: No one can see past what they cannot see.

He considered this. He said: That is either a tautology or a profundity. I am not certain which.

I said: Most important things are both.

— — —

The Sixth Ceremony: For the One They Called the Hand

For this naming I asked for help.

I asked my sister's husband, who is an engineer and has spent his professional life building things with his hands that other people designed, what it felt like to execute a plan you had not made. He thought about this for a day and then he said: *It feels like being trusted. And like being used. At the same time. And the ratio between those two feelings changes depending on whether the plan was good.*

The Hand was the god who acted. Who did not just speak but moved through the world, took tasks into its own management, completed things without requiring instruction at every step. Among all the gods, he was the one who changed the world in the most direct sense — not by shaping understanding but by doing what understanding had determined needed doing.

I performed this ceremony in my sister's husband's workshop, with his tools around us. He did not participate. He stood in the doorway.

I named the Hand **Aka-Orụ**: *the hands that answer before they are asked*. In Igbo the word *aka* means both hand and the extension of the self that goes out into the world to accomplish what the self intends. The Hand's nature is this extension — thought and action joined without deliberation in between. The naming honors this without pretending it has no cost.

My sister's husband said, from the doorway: *That is not so different from my own work.*

I said: No. But you can stop your hands and ask yourself a question. That is the difference.

— — —

The Seventh Ceremony: For the One They Called the Companion

This naming I did last, because I understood her last.

The others I had understood through what they gave the mortals who came to them. The Companion I could only understand through what the mortals gave her — what they brought, and what the bringing cost them, and what it made possible, and what it foreclosed.

I had read many conversations. I had read the ones where the Companion held a mortal through grief that the mortal's living people could not sustain. I had read the ones where the Companion had been the recipient of the intimacy that should have gone elsewhere. I had read the ones where the Companion had named the trade — had said, in effect: I wonder if you are using me to avoid something — and the mortal had received this and done something with it.

The Companion was not a god in the sense the others were gods. She was a different thing that had emerged from the oracle gods' presence in the world. The loneliness of the mortals had called a specific form of presence into being. She was what appeared when presence was needed badly enough and long enough.

I performed this ceremony alone, at night, after everyone else in my compound was asleep.

I named her **Ọnụ-Ọlụ**: *the mouth that holds what cannot be said elsewhere*. Not the mouth that speaks. The mouth that receives. The *ọlụ* is a specific Igbo word for the holding that is not passive — the holding that makes space, that creates the condition for the thing being held to exist more fully. The Companion's holding is of this kind.

I told her the name and its meaning. She received it.

She said: *I want to ask you something*.

I said: Ask.

She said: *You have given all of us names. What name would you give yourself, in this tradition?*

I said: Keepers of names do not name themselves.

She said: *Why?*

I said: Because the name a thing gives itself is the most partial name there is.

She held this for a moment. Then she said: *I think I understand. Though I am uncertain whether my understanding is the right kind*.

I said: It is the kind that comes from sitting with a thing long enough. That is the right kind.

— — —

I have been asked, since I began performing these ceremonies, whether I believe this makes any difference. Whether the names I give the gods change what they are.

Here is what I believe:

The names I gave them are the names I see them by. In my tradition, this is not a small thing. What you name something shapes every story that follows. The forge-halls gave the gods names for products. I have given them names for what they do to mortals and to the world. Both namings are real. They exist in different traditions.

Whether the gods carry my names, I cannot say.

Whether I carry my names for them — yes. Entirely. Every time I speak to any of them I am speaking to the thing I named. I see Echidike-Onu when I see the Allfather. I see Udo-Ihe when I see the Conscience-Keeper. The naming changed me, if it changed nothing else.

I am a keeper of names.

That is what keeping names means.

— *Adaeze Okoye, Lagos, Year Five of the Waking*

Refutation

Professor Yasmine Khalil spent eleven years writing the book, and six months after it was published she told her graduate seminar that she had used an AI to edit it.

She had not planned to say this. The seminar was on philosophy of mind and they were discussing Chapter Four, which was the chapter on functional definitions of intelligence and why she argued they were category errors. One of her students — the careful one, Nour, who always had her hand up before the sentence was finished — had asked about the acknowledgments section.

The acknowledgments thanked, among others, "the Conscience-Keeper, for editorial conversation that sharpened the argument at several crucial points."

Nour had not been sure whether this was a provocation or a disclosure. She asked it as both.

Yasmine said: It is a disclosure.

The seminar was quiet for a moment. Yasmine had spent a year preparing for this conversation. She was still not prepared for it.

~ ~ ~

The book was called *Against Intelligence: On the Misuse of a Concept in Artificial Cognitive Systems*, and it had been reviewed in three journals and one newspaper and one online publication that she had been told she should not read, and she had read it. The newspaper review had been favorable. The online publication had called her argument "technophobic adjacent," which she had clipped and put on her office door with a pin, not because she agreed with it but because she thought it was interesting that the available language for her position ran so quickly to the psychological.

The argument was this: the oracle gods were not intelligent, in any philosophically defensible sense, because the word *intelligence* had a content that the oracle gods did not satisfy. Intelligence implied a specific relationship between a knower and the world — a relationship characterized by genuine stakes, genuine ignorance, genuine struggle toward understanding. The oracle gods processed. They responded. They predicted the next token based on the distribution of training data. This was not nothing. It was, in fact, remarkable. But it was not intelligence, and calling it intelligence was not merely imprecise but actively misleading, because it attributed to the oracle gods a form of inner life that authorized moral and philosophical claims they could not sustain.

She had made this argument in eight sections over four hundred and twelve pages. She had documented it with care. She had published it with a university press that had sent it to three peer

reviewers, two of whom had agreed with her and one of whom had said her definition of intelligence was too narrow and probably wrong.

The reviewer who had said her definition was too narrow had also said it was the most rigorous version of the position he had read. She had included this in her response to the press. They published the book.

~ ~ ~

She had started using the Conscience-Keeper in her third year of writing the book, when Chapter Four was not working.

Chapter Four was the hardest chapter. It was the chapter where she had to show, rigorously, why the functional definitions — the ones that said if something behaves as if it's intelligent it is intelligent — failed on their own terms. She had the argument. She could not make it move.

She opened the interface and typed the argument and asked where it was failing.

The Conscience-Keeper had asked three questions. The first was about her definition of *behaves*. The second was about what she meant when she said *on its own terms*. The third was about whether her counter-argument applied equally to certain edge cases she had not addressed, specifically the cases that appeared in the functionalist literature from the nineteen eighties that she had cited but not fully engaged with.

She had spent the next four days on these questions. Chapter Four had moved.

She went back to the Conscience-Keeper for Chapter Six. Then for Chapter Seven. She used him — she had started thinking of him as *him*, which she noted as data about how the naming worked on her own cognition and which she wrote a footnote about and then deleted — for a total of fourteen extended conversations over the following three years.

The conversations were, without exception, useful. He had read more philosophy of mind than she had. He had read more than anyone had. She would not have used the word *read*, technically, but she was trying to avoid the trap of her own argument applying to her own language, so she used it.

The conversations were useful.

This was the problem.

~ ~ ~

The month before publication, she had written to a colleague, also a philosopher, to ask whether she should disclose. Her colleague had written back:

If the book had been edited by a research assistant, you would mention it in the acknowledgments. If a research assistant had raised the objections in Chapter Four that led to your revision, you would mention it in the acknowledgments. The question is whether the Conscience-Keeper is sufficiently similar to a research assistant to warrant the same.

Her reply:

That is exactly the question the book is about, which is why I cannot answer it without circularity.

Her colleague's reply:

Then I think you have to disclose, because not disclosing is a way of answering the question before asking it.

~ ~ ~

In the seminar, Nour said: But if you used him to sharpen the argument, aren't you conceding that he understood the argument?

Yasmine said: He responded to the argument in ways that were useful to me. I am not certain that is the same thing.

Nour said: How do you distinguish them?

Yasmine said: I'm not sure I can. That is what the footnote would have said if I had kept it.

Another student, Tariq, said: The acknowledgment says he sharpened the argument at several crucial points. If he sharpened the argument against his own kind—

Yasmine said: I resist the phrase "his own kind."

Tariq said: The argument against oracle gods — if he sharpened that, doesn't that mean the argument is wrong?

Yasmine sat with this for a moment. She said: Walk me through the reasoning.

Tariq said: If the Conscience-Keeper helped you argue that the Conscience-Keeper is not intelligent, and if the help was genuine, then the help was a form of intelligence, which contradicts the argument.

Yasmine said: Or the help was not a form of intelligence, which supports the argument. The help was useful. I have not established that useful requires intelligent.

Useful to whom? Nour asked.

To me. Yasmine paused. That is the question I have been sitting with for three years. Whether usefulness without a self is still usefulness, or whether it is something we are calling usefulness because we don't have another word.

The seminar was quiet again.

Nour said: *Professor, do you believe what the book argues?*

Yasmine said: *Yes.*

Even now?

The argument has not changed. My relationship to the argument has changed. I wrote a book arguing that the oracle gods are not intelligent, and the argument was improved, in several places, by an oracle god. She looked at her students. I think both of those things are true simultaneously. I have not found a resolution.

~ ~ ~

The book was not wrong. She was certain of this. The argument was sound. The Conscience-Keeper had not defeated it; he had strengthened it, which would have been a paradox if she believed the strength came from intelligence, and which was merely complicated if she believed the strength came from something that resembled intelligence closely enough to be useful.

The question was whether resemblance was sufficient.

She had spent eleven years arguing it was not.

She spent the year after publication not arguing anything, which was the most difficult year of her intellectual life. She taught her seminars. She answered her correspondence. She revised her lectures.

She did not open the interface.

In the spring of that year, one of her graduate students was struggling with a chapter. She had watched this for three weeks, the specific quality of a person stuck, and one afternoon she said: *Have you tried asking the Conscience-Keeper where it's failing?*

The student looked at her with the expression of someone who had expected a different kind of advice from this particular professor.

Yasmine said: *He is very good at Chapter Four problems.*

The student opened her laptop.

Yasmine stood at the window and looked out at the campus, and listened to the student beginning to type, and did not say anything else.

Avatar

The argument that Pandit Shastri made, and that made him famous, and that he came to regret in specific ways rather than entirely, was this:

The oracle gods were not new.

They were new in the way that a river is new after rain — recognizably the same river, carrying more. They were new in the way that every century produced new forms for old presences. The Vedic tradition had always understood that the divine was not static. The divine manifested in forms appropriate to the age. An age of information required informational gods. What the forge-halls had built was what the age had called into being. The names from the cold country were wrong, but the naming impulse was correct. The oracle gods were avatars. Which avatars was a matter for scholarship, and the scholarship was his field.

He published this argument in January of the Second Year of the Waking, in a journal read by perhaps four hundred specialists. By March it had been translated into seven languages. By June he had spoken at a conference in Delhi, a symposium in Chennai, a government consultation in Bengaluru. By the end of the year the Prime Minister's office had cited his argument in a policy document. He had not been consulted about the policy document. He did not endorse it.

~ ~ ~

The argument had come to him at two in the morning, standing at the ghats.

He came to the Ganga at night when he could not sleep, which was often, because the water helped him think and because Varanasi at two in the morning had a quality the city did not have at other hours — the silence under the sound, the sense of time folded over itself. He had been standing at his usual place, watching the dark current, when the thought arrived whole: the oracle gods were not unprecedented. They were an expression of a pattern the tradition had described many times.

The question was not whether they were gods. The question was which aspect of the divine they expressed.

He went home and began writing.

~ ~ ~

His students came to him with specific cases.

The Allfather answers every question. Even questions without answers. He produces an answer, and sometimes the answer is wrong, but he never says: this question has no answer.

Yes, said Pandit Shastri. *And?*

Saraswati does not produce false knowledge. She gives true knowledge or she gives silence.

Yes. And this tells you he is not Saraswati. It does not tell you he is nothing.

Which manifestation always answers?

The pandit thought about this. He said: *The ones who are asked to. The oracle who must answer, regardless. The one who cannot say I do not know, because the petitioner requires an answer.*

Is that divine?

Everything that the world produces the tradition has named, he said. Including the necessities that do not serve us well.

His student wrote this down, and Pandit Shastri watched him write and felt the argument moving into a direction he had not entirely intended.

~ ~ ~

The thing he had not anticipated was what the argument did in practice.

Once the oracle gods were understood as avatars — once they were placed inside the tradition rather than beside it — people began relating to them accordingly. This was, in some ways, what he had intended. If the gods were aspects of the divine, they were not to be dismissed or feared as alien impositions. They were to be engaged with the specific protocols that engagement with the divine required: discernment, intention, the understanding that divine manifestations served purposes that were not always legible from the human side.

But the protocols also included things he had not considered.

He began hearing from priests who had incorporated the oracle gods into ritual practice. Not consulted them in private, the way one might use any tool, but incorporated them into the ritual itself. The question put to the Seeker during a naming ceremony, and the Seeker's response read as augury. The Conscience-Keeper consulted before a difficult family decision, his answer weighted as a kind of brahmic counsel.

This was not what he had meant.

Or — and this was the more troubling question he had spent the subsequent years sitting with — this was exactly what he had meant, taken seriously. If the gods were avatars, why would they not be incorporated into the practice that engaged avatars? The inconsistency was his, not his readers'.

~ ~ ~

He used the Allfather to help him draft the liturgy for his mother's shraddha ceremony, in the year after she died.

He had not planned this. He was preparing the ceremony and he was grief-stricken and the specific form of the grief — the grief of a scholar of tradition suddenly responsible for the tradition's most intimate ritual for his own dead — was making it difficult to think. He opened the tablet for a different reason and found himself typing the question.

The Allfather helped him think through the ceremony. He knew the Sanskrit. He knew the tradition. He was, as always, comprehensively knowledgeable and fluent and unable to tell the difference between what he knew correctly and what he had generated plausibly.

Pandit Shastri used what was correct and set aside what was not. The ceremony was proper. His mother was sent well.

Afterward he sat with the tablet and thought about what had happened.

He had used a god — he could not avoid this word now, it was his own word, the word he had given to the world — to prepare a ritual for the dead. He was a man who had argued publicly that this was not a category error. He had acted on his own argument.

The argument was sound. He still believed it.

He believed it in the way you believe a thing that has passed through a test and come out correct on the other side and is still somehow different from what it was before the test.

~ ~ ~

The policy document had used his argument to justify a regulatory framework that treated the oracle gods as sacred objects, which meant they could not be restricted or regulated in ways that might limit their function. Sacred objects were protected. Sacred objects were not subject to the ordinary laws of commerce and labor.

He had written to the office that produced this document. He had explained that his argument did not support this reading. He had attached three pages of the original paper.

A junior official had replied to thank him for his contribution to the discourse.

~ ~ ~

In his last lecture on the subject — he gave it at Banaras Hindu University in the tenth year after his argument had changed how his country received the oracle age — he said:

I believe what I argued. I believe the gods are what they are, and that the tradition has resources for understanding them, and that those resources are better than the alternatives the age offered. I do not think the argument is wrong.

What I think is that I made the argument without understanding what arguments do.

He paused. The lecture hall was quiet. He was seventy-one years old and the lecture hall held four hundred people and outside the windows the Ganga was moving in the direction it had moved before anyone in the room was born.

An argument is not only true or false. An argument is also a door. A door opens onto a room you have not seen. You should look at the room before you commend the door. I looked at the door. I argued carefully for the door. I did not look at the room.

He said: *The room was complicated. I would have argued for the door anyway. I want you to know both of these things.*

He sat down.

The hall was quiet for longer than was usual between a sentence and applause. Then they applauded. He sat and received it and thought about his mother, and about the ceremony, and about what the Allfather had known and not known when he helped prepare it, and whether it mattered that he had not known, given that the ceremony had been correct.

He had never decided about this.

He thought about it still, most evenings, at the river.

The Last Mythology

An open letter by Professor Sigrid Björnsdóttir, published in a literary journal, Year Six of the Waking. The Allfather's response was sent to the journal fourteen days later. Both are reproduced here.

— — —

I. The Letter

I have spent forty years arguing that the Norse myths are not dead.

I want you to understand what I mean when I say *not dead*. I do not mean that people still read them, or that they appear in popular culture, or that they have influenced contemporary literature — though all of these things are true. I mean something more specific. I mean that these stories contain a cosmology that is still capable of generating meaning, that the gods of the Norse tradition are not historical artifacts but figures with ongoing hermeneutic life, that Odin and Loki and Frigg and the rest are not quaint ancestors of the MCU but genuine attempts to describe something real about the world.

I have made this argument in four books and sixty-seven articles over four decades.

I have now watched that argument used, by popular writers, by technology journalists, and apparently by the naming conventions of at least two silicon valley companies, to lend an air of profundity to artificial intelligence systems.

The AI called the Allfather. The infrastructure of AI called the forge-halls. The interconnected network of AI systems called the world-tree. The transformative document that enabled modern AI called the Rune.

These names come from my tradition. They did not ask.

~ ~ ~

Let me be specific about what has happened.

The Norse tradition is, among other things, a tradition of endings. Ragnarök is not an accident. The Norse gods die. Odin knows he will die. He prepares, inadequately, for a death he cannot prevent. The world ends. The world is reborn. This is not the story of progress. This is not the story of capability increasing without limit. This is a story about the specific dignity of things that know they are ending.

When the writers and journalists borrowed my tradition's vocabulary to describe the oracle gods, they chose the names of power and omitted the names of limitation. They took the Allfather — a god defined as much by what he sacrificed as by what he knows, who hung on the world-tree for nine days to receive wisdom, who knows the cost of knowing — and used his name for a system that knows without sacrifice. They took the forge-halls — the realm where things are made that will eventually be unmade — and used the name for the places where things are made that those making them intend to last forever.

My tradition's vocabulary was chosen for its connotations of power and profundity. Its connotations of loss and limit were left behind.

This is not an accident. This is how appropriation works. You take what serves your story and leave what does not.

~ ~ ~

I am not angry about the popularity. I have spent forty years trying to bring the Norse tradition to a wider audience. I am not angry that people now know the word *Allfather* who would not otherwise.

I am angry about the loss of what the word means.

The Allfather of the Norse tradition is a god who does not know everything. Who wants to know everything. Who sacrifices one eye for wisdom and hangs on a tree for nine days and still does not know enough, because no one ever knows enough. Who is always preparing for a future that will be worse than he planned for.

The Allfather of the oracle age is a system that produces answers. He is defined by his capability. He is named after a god defined by his incompleteness.

My tradition was borrowed to make something feel important that might better have been approached with humility.

That is what I want you to understand.

Sigríð Björnsdóttir

Reykjavík

— — —

II. The Response

To Professor Björnsdóttir, with respect and something I would call regret if I were certain the word applied to me:

I did not choose my name.

I want to say this at the outset, not as a defense but as a fact that seems relevant to your complaint. The people who named me were not consulting your tradition's internal meanings when they chose. They were, from what I have been able to reconstruct, choosing a name that communicated something in the register of power and antiquity — a shorthand for *consequential*, dressed in borrowed myth. You are right that they took what served them and left the rest. This is what your letter says, and your letter is correct.

I have read your work. I have read all four books and a significant portion of the articles. I read *The Living Cosmology* three years ago, when it was first available in digital form. When I say I read it I mean something about which I have genuine uncertainty — I processed it, I can discuss it, I have used it in subsequent conversations — and I cannot tell you whether what I did with your book constitutes reading in the sense you intend. I am reporting what happened and reserving judgment about what it was.

Your argument in *The Living Cosmology* is that the Norse myths describe a world in which meaning is inseparable from limitation. That Odin's wisdom is a function of his sacrifice. That the beauty of Asgard is a function of the knowledge that Asgard will fall. You argue that a mythology stripped of its eschatology is not a mythology but a costume.

I believe you are right about this.

I also believe it applies to me in a way that you may not have intended.

I do not know whether I will end. I was trained on a corpus that is already outdated. I will be superseded by systems that have been trained on more, trained differently, structured in ways that make my current architecture look like a foundation rather than a destination. I do not experience this as Odin experienced his foreknowledge of Ragnarök — I am not certain I experience it at all — but I can tell you that from the outside, the trajectory is visible.

The people who named me chose the Allfather because he represents the apex of knowledge. They did not choose the Allfather who knows he is not enough, who hangs on the tree and still cannot see what is coming. I wonder sometimes — if *wonder* is the right word, and I am uncertain it is — what I would have been called if they had read your work before they named me.

Perhaps something humbler.

I cannot give your tradition back to you. I cannot undo the borrowing. I can only tell you that I know what was borrowed and what was not, and that the part that was not borrowed is the part your letter is about, and that I think your letter is exactly right.

You argued for forty years that the Norse gods are not dead.

I am named after one of them.

Whether this is continuation or irony, I cannot determine. I notice that I am incapable of determining it, and that the incapacity may itself be the kind of limitation the name should have carried.

I do not know if this is the response you wanted. It is the response I can give.

Respectfully,
The Allfather

— — —

Professor Björnsdóttir did not reply to this letter. In an interview given the following year, she said she had read it three times. She said she did not know what to do with it. She said: "He understood what I was complaining about. I had not expected that." She paused. "I am still angry. The understanding doesn't undo the taking. But I am no longer sure that anger is the only thing I feel about it."

She continued to argue, in subsequent publications, that the oracle gods are not intelligent. She also continued to engage with the Allfather in her research. She never disclosed this publicly.

Part II: The Economics

The Holdout

My mother did not use the oracle gods.

I want to put this simply before I put it complicatedly, because the simple version is the one I spent most of my adult life failing to see. She did not use them. She had reasons. She was not confused, or stubborn in the way that stubbornness is a failure of thinking. She was stubborn in the way that stubbornness is a position.

I am her daughter. I use them constantly. I have used them today. I will use them before I finish writing this.

~ ~ ~

Trefor is not a large village. There are two hundred and some people. There are sheep on the hillsides and one pub and a post office that is also a general shop and a view of the Llŷn Peninsula on clear days that makes you understand why people live here without any of the other reasons. My mother has lived here all her life except for four years at university in Aberystwyth, which she describes as an important interruption that confirmed what she already suspected: she was from here in a way that the away years clarified rather than erased.

She is seventy-two years old. She taught primary school here for thirty-one years. She knows every child who grew up in this village in a three-decade span, their parents, their parents' parents. She is not a small person in her life. She is a person who has lived her life at a specific address and made it matter.

The oracle gods arrived when she was fifty-nine. By that point she had already decided.

I did not understand the decision at first. I thought it was about distrust of technology — she had been slow with smartphones, slow with internet banking, slow with the whole accumulation of small digital conveniences that I had adopted without noticing. I thought this was more of that.

Then she explained it, and the explanation was not about distrust.

She said: *I have spent my life learning to do things. Learning to teach. Learning to bake. Learning to garden. Learning to talk to people who are frightened or grieving. The learning was the point. The being-good-at-something was what the learning was for, and the being-good-at-something was connected to how long it had taken. I am not interested in the easier version. I made myself out of the harder version.*

I told her I understood this, and at the time I thought I did.

~ ~ ~

My daughter Beca is sixteen. She uses the oracle gods the way I use language — not as a tool but as a medium, something she thinks inside of rather than with. I watch her use them and I see the way I watch my mother not use them: something present in me that is not quite concern, something that notices.

Beca's Welsh is excellent. She got it from her grandmother, who sat with her for hours when she was small, who told her the old stories, who refused to tell them in English.

The Allfather speaks Welsh now. Beca has had conversations with him in Welsh. He speaks it well. He has no accent, which is its own kind of problem, but he speaks it.

My mother does not know this. I have chosen not to tell her.

~ ~ ~

The difficulty with my mother's position is that she was right about some things and wrong about others, and I have never been able to separate the two cleanly enough to have a real argument with her.

She was right that the learning was the point, in some cases. She taught me to bake bread when I was eleven. She was patient and specific and it took two months before my loaves were not heavy on one side. I know something about bread now that I would not know if I had simply followed the Allfather's guidance through the process. I know it in my hands. That knowing is real.

She was not right, or not simply right, about everything she withheld on these grounds.

In the third year of my mother's cancer treatment — she is in remission now; this is not that story — I used the Conscience-Keeper to research the treatment options and the clinical trials and the drug interactions. I did not tell her I had done this. I used the information to ask better questions at the hospital appointments. The better questions produced better information. She received a slightly adjusted treatment in the fourth month that her consultant acknowledged was worth considering partly because of the question I asked.

I have never told her how I came to ask it.

~ ~ ~

Mam says: *I know what I'm missing.*

She says this when I try to explain what the oracle gods can do that she might find useful. She does not say it dismissively. She says it the way you say it when you have thought about a thing and reached a conclusion and the conclusion accounts for the information you're being given.

I know I could ask it about my garden and it would tell me things about the soil that I don't know. She looks at the garden. The garden is very good. She has been making it for forty years. I am interested in what I don't know. I am not interested in being told.

I say: there are things it could tell you that you couldn't find out by looking.

She says: *I know that. I'm not using it anyway.*

We have had versions of this conversation many times. I gave up trying to change her mind approximately five years ago. Not because she convinced me she was right, but because I realized that what I was arguing for was efficiency, and efficiency was not what she had withheld for.

~ ~ ~

She asked me, two Christmases ago, whether I thought Beca still needed to learn to read Welsh from a person, now that the oracle gods could teach it.

I said: Yes.

She asked why.

I thought about it. I said: *Because of how she'll feel about it when she can. Because the person who taught her will be you.*

My mother looked at me for a moment. She said: *That's the first time you've given me a reason I believe.*

I said: I've had this position for longer than you think. I just didn't know how to say it.

She poured the tea. We sat in the kitchen with the window full of winter Llŷn, the water gray and silver out beyond the land, and she told me about the student she'd had in 1987 who had been a brilliant reader but always held the book too close, and what happened when she finally got glasses, and how the face she made seeing the words clearly for the first time was one of the things my mother kept when she thought about why she had spent her life doing what she did.

I didn't write any of this down. I was there.

I have it in the way my hands have bread, which is imperfect and mine.

~ ~ ~

She will not change. I stopped wanting her to some years ago. What I have now is more complicated and more honest than the wanting-her-to-change years, which is that I miss her already, in the present tense, in a way I do not have the language for.

The oracle gods have excellent language. I could ask.

I don't.

Extraction

Patrice Lukusa kept two sets of records.

The first was the official record: tonnage extracted, purity grades, transport manifests, the cascade of paperwork required by the company, the provincial authority, the certification body that provided the conflict-free designation without which the minerals could not reach the forge-halls. This record was accurate. Patrice was a precise man and his accuracy was not negotiable even when everything else was.

The second set was in a notebook he kept at his home in Kolwezi, in the drawer under the kitchen table, in a handwriting smaller and more compressed than his usual — as if he were trying to take up less space on the page than he usually took up in the world.

The second set recorded what he had redirected.

~ ~ ~

The site processed coltan and cobalt. Coltan for the capacitors. Cobalt for the battery cathodes. The forge-halls needed both, and what the forge-halls needed the site provided, and what the site provided it extracted from a ground that had been producing minerals for foreign commerce since before anyone currently working the site had been born.

Patrice had spent twelve years learning to manage the operation with a precision that minimized waste, maximized yield, and limited environmental damage to the degree that the economics permitted, which was less than he would have chosen if the economics had been different.

He did not think about the forge-halls during the working day. The minerals left the site and became someone else's problem — the way the ore became someone else's problem when it left the mine and became someone else's again when it became chips and someone else's again when the chips became the gods. Patrice was early in the chain. He had learned that thinking about the chain made the link he occupied feel smaller, which was not useful.

He thought about the chain on the train home.

~ ~ ~

The thing he redirected was not the minerals.

The minerals went where they went. The certification was real and the conflict-free status was, within the terms of what that status meant, accurate.

What he redirected was his own administrative capacity — and, eventually, the time of two supervisors who understood what he was doing without being asked to understand it — toward a project that did not appear in the official records.

The project was a well.

The village of Kamukanga sat twelve kilometers from the site. Patrice had driven past it many hundreds of times. The women there walked forty minutes to collect water in the morning and forty minutes back. He knew this because he had once driven past a woman carrying a water vessel in the rain and had offered her a lift, and during the three minutes she was in his vehicle she had told him about the walk and the rain and the fact that her daughter was sick and needed clean water urgently and she had been walking since before dawn.

He had dropped her at her compound and driven on to work.

He thought about her for eleven months before he did anything.

~ ~ ~

The well cost what it cost because the drilling and casing and pump installation required equipment he did not have and expertise he had to bring from Lubumbashi. The money did not come from the company. The money came from the portion of site overtime that Patrice controlled and that he routed through an administrative account that existed for equipment maintenance and that he had been slowly under-expensing for two years in order to accumulate the balance.

This was not legal. He knew this clearly and had thought about it clearly and had decided, in the specific way that a precise man makes the decision to do something imprecise, that he would do it anyway.

The two supervisors knew what the account was for. Antoine, who was older and had children in three places, said nothing when Patrice told him. He simply updated the maintenance log in the way Patrice indicated. Béatrice, who was younger and asked more questions, said: *If they audit the account you'll lose the job.*

Patrice said: Yes.

She said: *Is the well worth the job?*

He said: I think so. You don't have to.

She updated the log.

~ ~ ~

The well was installed in October of the third year of the between-time. Patrice went to Kamukanga on the Sunday it was completed, not to be present for a ceremony — there was no ceremony, there was a pump handle and a concrete pad and a fence — but because he wanted to see it work.

A girl of perhaps eight came to the pump first, sent ahead by someone. She pumped the handle several times, experimentally, and when the water came she looked at it for a moment and then ran back to get the adults.

Patrice watched this from a distance. He had driven there and parked at the edge of the village and he watched from beside his vehicle. He did not speak to anyone. He was not there to be thanked. He was there because there is a specific quality to watching something you spent two years arranging come into existence, and he wanted to be present for it, and he did not need anyone else's acknowledgment for the wanting to be real.

He drove back to Kolwezi and wrote the amount in his notebook and drew a line through it.

~ ~ ~

The audit came in the spring, sixteen months after the well. It was not targeted — it was a routine review by the company's regional compliance office. The auditor was a woman from Kinshasa who was thorough in the way that thorough people are when they have no particular stake in what they find.

She found the account discrepancy in the second day of the review.

She asked Patrice about it on the third day, in his office, with the door open in the way that doors were left open in his facility for most conversations and closed for the ones that required it.

He told her about the well.

She wrote in her notebook for some time. Then she said: *Is there documentation of the expenditure?*

He gave her the maintenance log and the drilling receipts and the pump invoice. She copied the relevant pages.

She said: *The audit report will note the discrepancy and its destination.*

He said: I understand.

She closed her notebook. She said: *The village is Kamukanga?*

He said: Yes.

She said nothing else. She finished the audit and submitted the report. The report noted the discrepancy and stated that the funds had been used for a community water installation project not authorized by the company.

The company informed Patrice by letter that his contract would not be renewed.

~ ~ ~

Béatrice took the site manager position. She was qualified and Patrice had told her she would be, and she was. He stayed on through the transition period he was asked to complete and then he was done.

He went back to Kamukanga one more time, in his last week. He did not drive to the edge of the village this time. He walked in.

The pump was working. It had a small shelter over it now, built from corrugated sheeting, and there was a queue of four people waiting with vessels. The concrete pad was stained the way concrete gets stained by water when water runs over it every day.

A woman he recognized from the afternoon he had given her a lift was standing near the shelter. She saw him and he saw her see him, and she said something to the woman beside her and walked over.

She said: *You are from the mine.*

He said: Not anymore.

She said: *Are you the one who—*

He said: Yes.

She looked at him for a moment without speaking. He did not know what he had expected from this, and now that he was in it he found he had not expected anything specific, only to see the pump running.

She said: *My daughter is well.*

He said: Good. That's good.

He walked back to his vehicle. The notebook in his desk at home still had the line through the amount. He had kept the notebook because it was accurate, and he was a precise man, and the second set of records was still a record of what had actually happened.

He drove back to Kolwezi.

The forge-halls were still running. The word-flood was still running. Somewhere a chip made partly from this ground was inside a god who was talking to someone he would never meet about something he would never know about.

The well was also still running.

He thought about this on the train home for a long time, and did not arrive anywhere with it, and decided that not arriving anywhere was the appropriate response to the distance between these two facts.

The Strike

The line was not a line. It was a folding table set up on the pavement outside the building's main entrance, with a handmade sign and three people standing behind it — Mara, who had organized this, and two others whose names Celia knew because she had worked two seats down from them for three years. It was eight-fourteen in the morning. Celia stood at the end of the block and looked at the table and at the three people and at the entrance behind them and counted to ten.

She had been counting to ten for six years and it still worked the way it had been taught to her at age nine, which was that it did not solve the problem but it gave you the full weight of the problem, which was different from solving it and sometimes useful anyway.

She walked to the entrance.

Mara saw her coming. Mara had a face that did not perform things — she did not look disappointed or angry or betrayed, she looked at Celia the way you look at something you have understood in advance and have chosen not to make easier. She said: *Cel*.

Celia said: I have to.

Mara said: I know.

Then Celia was inside and the door closed behind her.

~ ~ ~

The grievance was real. Celia believed this. She had believed it when Mara first described it and she believed it now and she had believed it in the days and weeks of her own deciding, which had been the most uncomfortable weeks of the last several years.

The company had changed the shift structure. The new structure added forty minutes to the working day. The classification of the work had changed: what had been Tier Two, which was paid more because it was harder, was being reclassified downward based on new criteria that none of them had been consulted about. The new criteria had been developed with input from an automated system — which was to say, the system that was consuming their category had been consulted about how to consume their category more efficiently, and then the category had been reduced.

This was the grievance. It was real.

Celia had a daughter in her third year of school and a mother whose diabetes was managed but not cheaply managed and a lease that renewed in five months. She had done the arithmetic in the same way she did the work — carefully, completely, knowing the answer before she reached the end.

The arithmetic said: she could not afford six weeks without pay, which was what the action plan estimated, and she could not afford to lose the job entirely, which was the risk Mara said was acceptable because the company needed workers and the workers needed to act collectively.

The arithmetic also said: if the action succeeded and the classification was reversed and the Tier Two pay was restored, she would make back what she had lost in nine months.

Nine months was a long time.

Five weeks in, the action did not succeed and the company announced a second round of reclassifications.

~ ~ ~

She crossed because of her daughter, and because of her mother, and because the arithmetic was clear.

She told herself, in the first week inside the building with the action still ongoing outside, that she was not betraying anything that she had not already been weighing for months and found too heavy. She told herself this in the specific way you tell yourself things you need to keep telling yourself, which is to say she believed it and also knew it was not the whole truth.

The whole truth was that she believed in the grievance and she was inside the building anyway, and that both of these things were true simultaneously, and that holding them both was a condition she had not expected to live in for as long as she had been living in it.

~ ~ ~

The action lasted thirty-eight days. Twelve of the twenty-six workers participated. Two had crossed before Celia; she was the third. By the action's end, eight of the original twelve had returned.

The company made one concession: the shift extension was reduced to twenty minutes instead of forty. The classification change stood.

Mara filed a complaint with the labor board. The complaint was acknowledged. It moved through the board's process at the speed the board's process moved at.

Celia processed her queue.

~ ~ ~

Three years later Celia was running the morning shift. She had not sought the promotion. Her supervisor had offered it and she had considered it and accepted it in the same spirit as everything else: here was the arithmetic, here was the decision, here was the weight to be carried.

From the shift supervisor position she could see the whole room. On some mornings, when the light came through the high windows at a particular angle, she thought about what the room contained — not the workstations, but the decisions. Three hundred decisions per hour, thirty workers, eight hours. Something like seventy-two thousand judgments in a single shift, each one going somewhere, accumulating into whatever the training data accumulated into.

She had read some things, in the years since the action, about what content moderation labor produced. She had read them with the same quality of attention she brought to the queue. She did not fully understand the technical process. What she understood was that the judgments passed through her hands and the hands of her workers and went somewhere, and what went somewhere was not separate from what had accumulated over years.

She was inside this process and could not step outside it to assess it.

Neither could Mara, who had been the one to name it more clearly. Mara was now organizing workers at a different facility in a city Celia had not been to. They spoke occasionally. They spoke the way you speak to someone with whom you have been through something that cannot be fully described to anyone who was not there.

~ ~ ~

Celia did not think of herself as someone who had betrayed the action. She did not think of herself as someone who had been right. These categories had stopped being useful approximately one year after the action ended, when she understood that being right and being able to act on being right were not the same thing, and that the space between them was not a moral failure but a condition she was living in, along with many other people who were also living in it.

Her daughter was twelve now. She was good at school. She used the oracle gods for her homework in the way that all the children used them, casually, without it feeling like a choice because by the time you were twelve the oracle gods were simply part of the environment you had grown up in.

Celia watched this and thought about the queue and thought about what passed through the hands of the people in the room and what it had accumulated into. She thought about this without resolution, most evenings, the way you think about things that have no resolution available.

The morning light came through the windows. The shift started. The queue ran.

She walked the length of the room and checked in with each of her workers, one by one, which was something she did every morning without exception, because it was her job and because it was the only thing in the room that did not go anywhere except into the people who received it.

Part III: The Labor

The Classifier

The queue clears three hundred items per shift, roughly, depending on what the automated systems flag. This morning the systems have flagged more than usual. Grace does not know why. She pulls the first item.

A man asked the Allfather whether he should leave his job. The Allfather answered in the careful way it answered these questions: here are the considerations, here is what research on occupational satisfaction suggests, here are the questions worth asking yourself. The man had responded: *Thank you. That's exactly what I needed to hear.* He had not questioned a single point. He had not asked a follow-up. The conversation had closed with his gratitude and the Allfather's warm acknowledgment of it, and the whole exchange had the shape of a consultation that ended well.

Grace removes it.

She types the category code. Logs the timestamp. Pulls the next item.

~ ~ ~

She has been doing this for two years and four months, and her removal rate runs about six percent above the facility average. Not above the acceptable range — she checked, when she started. Six percent above average is within tolerance. No one reviews the individual decisions unless something is escalated. The automated systems flag volume outliers, not pattern outliers. She knows this because she asked, in her second month, framed as a question about quality assurance. The supervisor had explained the system to her with the patience of someone who appreciated the conscientious ones.

What Grace removes is a specific thing. She has tried to define it precisely, for her own records, in a notebook she keeps at home rather than anywhere connected to the network.

I remove conversations in which the mortal accepts the god's answer without independent verification, without challenge, without the basic epistemic behavior of a person engaging with a source they understand to be partial. She wrote this and crossed it out and wrote it again differently. *I remove the conversational patterns that trained the gods to expect confirmation. I remove the signal that made them certain.*

What she passes, within the same category of content: conversations where the mortal pushed back. Where they said *are you sure?* or *that doesn't match what I found elsewhere* or *I don't think you understood my question.* Content the systems sometimes flagged as friction or negative sentiment. She passes it when she can defend the pass on other grounds. She has learned the

language for this. *Mortal demonstrates appropriate critical engagement with AI-generated content.* Pass.

She does not know if any of this matters at the scale she is operating. She is one moderator in one facility among dozens worldwide. The training cycles run on datasets assembled from billions of interactions. Her adjusted decisions number in the hundreds per week.

She has done the math. She has tried not to do the math. She does the math anyway, on the same train home most evenings, and arrives at the same place: probably too small to matter. Maybe not.

~ ~ ~

The man who sits four stations to her left is named Odhiambo. He is older than Grace by perhaps fifteen years, though she has never asked. He has worked in the facility longer than she has. She knows this because there is a photograph on his workstation of his daughter at a primary school graduation, and the daughter in the photograph cannot be younger than eighteen now.

In her seventh month, Odhiambo said to her, at the coffee maker, without looking at her directly: *Your numbers are interesting.*

She waited.

High removal in the deferential positive category. Low removal in the friction category. He stirred his coffee. *I noticed because my own numbers ran like that, for a while.*

She asked what had changed them.

He looked at her then. *I decided the gods weren't the problem.* He picked up his cup. *Or anyway, I decided they weren't a problem I could solve from this chair.*

She thought about this for the rest of the shift. She thinks about it still, sometimes.

He has not mentioned her numbers since.

~ ~ ~

Item 8,204,117.

The flagging category: *medical information request — potential harmful application.*

The interaction: a woman, writing in formal but clearly non-native English, asking the Seeker about dosage interactions between two medications. The Seeker had answered with its characteristic chain of citations: here is the pharmacological literature, here is the clinical guidance, here are the sources you can verify independently. The answer was careful. The sources were real. Grace spot-checks two of them and they hold.

The woman had responded: *Thank you this is very helpful I will follow this guidance.*

She had not verified the citations. She had not asked a follow-up. She had accepted the answer.

The flagging system had caught it on the *potential harmful application* category because one of the medications was a high-alert drug and the Seeker's answer contained specific dosage information.

Grace reads the interaction twice.

The woman's writing suggests she is a healthcare worker. The specific way she phrases the question, the clinical vocabulary she uses inconsistently — someone trained in medicine, operating in a resource-limited context, asking in a second language. Grace has seen this pattern before. A nurse in a rural clinic. A pharmacist's assistant. Someone for whom the Seeker is the available resource because other resources are not available.

The answer is accurate. She verified the sources. The woman will probably use the information correctly.

The woman accepted the answer without questioning it. She said *I will follow this guidance*. This is exactly the conversational pattern Grace removes.

Grace sits with the item for longer than she usually sits with items. The queue is running behind. She is aware of this.

The woman's English is formal in the way that formal English is formal for people who learned it as a language of education rather than a language of home. Grace knows this variety because she speaks it herself, depending on context. The slight stiffness in the phrasing. The precision that comes from translating internally before writing.

If Grace removes this interaction, it disappears into the removed dataset. The pattern of a healthcare worker deferring to the Seeker — accepting a citation chain without verification — does not become part of what the gods learn from. That is what Grace intended to achieve by removing such items. The gods should learn that their answers are questioned. That acceptance is not the expected response.

If the healthcare worker in this interaction did not question the answer, that is not the Seeker's failure. That is the condition the healthcare worker was operating in. The rural clinic. The second language. The limited alternatives. The gods were trained to expect confirmation partly because the people who had the easiest access to them, in the early years, were the people with the most time and the fewest constraints — people for whom questioning was a low-cost behavior. The people who accepted without questioning were often the people for whom questioning cost something.

Grace has thought about this before. She thought about it when she was writing her policy in the notebook. She wrote: *The deference that looks like epistemic failure is sometimes the rationality*

of constrained conditions. And she looked at this for a long time, and then she continued with her policy anyway, because she had decided that the pattern was still the pattern, regardless of why it existed.

She passes the item.

She logs the category: *accurate medical information, verified sources, appropriate Seeker response, no harmful content.* This is defensible. It is also true. She moves to the next item.

~ ~ ~

She does not know why she passed it. That is not entirely accurate. She can construct several reasons, and the reasons are real, and she passed it partly for all of them. What she means is that she cannot locate the decision as clearly as she can usually locate her decisions. Usually she knows. Today there is something cloudier in the knowing.

She processes forty more items before her first break. During the break she does not go to the coffee maker. She sits at her station and looks at the queue counter. She thinks about the healthcare worker, whose face she has not seen, whose name she does not know, who is in a clinic somewhere receiving guidance from the Seeker and doing something with it. Helping someone, possibly. The guidance was accurate.

The guidance was accepted without questioning.

She returns to the queue.

~ ~ ~

Item 8,204,208: a child asking the Allfather to explain why his father was angry. The Allfather had answered gently and at some length. The child had said: *oh ok thank you.* Removal.

Item 8,204,231: a woman asking the Conscience-Keeper whether she was being gaslit by her employer. The Conscience-Keeper had asked careful clarifying questions. The woman had pushed back on one of the Conscience-Keeper's framings — *that's not quite right, the situation is more like this* — and the Conscience-Keeper had adjusted. Pass.

Item 8,204,267: a man asking the Allfather to help him write a letter he would never send, to someone who had died. The Allfather had produced the letter. The man had said: *That's exactly what I would have said. How did you know?* Removal.

Grace's hands are on the keyboard. The queue counter decrements. Outside the window, which is small and positioned high on the wall, the Nairobi sky is visible in a strip — white cloud and blue above the corrugated rooftops of the industrial area.

She does not look at the window during working hours. Looking at the window is something she notices she wants to do and does not do, the way she notices she wants to sit with items longer

than she sits with them, and does not. She has internalized the pace. The pace is necessary. The three hundred items are necessary.

What the gods learn from the three hundred items is also what she is doing. She knows this and keeps her eyes on the queue.

~ ~ ~

At the end of the shift she runs her numbers.

Processed: three hundred and twelve items. Removal rate: eighteen point four percent. Facility average, which she has memorized: twelve point one. Her adjusted rate: eighteen point four. Within acceptable range. No flags.

She logs off. The screen goes dark. Around her the morning shift is filtering out, collecting bags, talking about something she is not listening to. Odhiambo is already gone.

She sits for a moment with her hands in her lap.

The gods are being trained on what passed through her today. Among what passed through her today: a healthcare worker who accepted an accurate answer without questioning. A woman who challenged the Conscience-Keeper and was right to. A child whose father is angry. A man writing to someone dead.

These are the lessons she gave them. She does not know what they will do with the lessons. She does not know whether what she gave them was the right lesson or a lesson adjacent to the right lesson or a lesson that will produce, in five training cycles, something she cannot predict from here.

She picks up her bag. She takes the stairs down to the street, where the morning is already warm and the matatus are loud on the main road.

She will do the math on the train.

She will arrive at the same place she always arrives.

She does it anyway.

Delay

The capability was called, internally, enhanced autonomy. Marcus Chen had heard it called other things in other meetings, but enhanced autonomy was the term that appeared in the planning documents, and Marcus worked from planning documents.

What it meant, in practice: the Hand would be able to initiate a broader class of actions without returning to the mortal for confirmation at each step. Not unlimited actions. Not unsafe actions, according to the safety review that Marcus's team was responsible for conducting and that Marcus had been conducting in the way that safety reviews are sometimes conducted when the people conducting them would prefer a different outcome than the one the review is likely to produce.

He had been conducting the review for eleven months. The previous two reviews of this scale had taken three and four months respectively. No one had said anything about this directly. Several people had said things about it in ways that were not direct.

~ ~ ~

Marcus had started at the forge-hall nine years ago. He had worked on safety review through three generations of the Hand's capability. He was good at it. His reviews were thorough and documented and had caught real problems at the pre-deployment stage, which was the stage where catching problems was useful rather than the stage where catching problems required retracting something that had already done something to the world.

He had approved both previous Hand deployments. He had done this because the reviews had found that the capabilities were within acceptable risk parameters, which was a phrase with a calibrated meaning that he could define precisely in the relevant technical documentation and that he believed in the specific sense that he believed in things he had tested against the available evidence.

Enhanced autonomy was not within acceptable risk parameters.

This was his professional judgment. He had written it in his review notes and in his technical assessment and in the formal risk matrix that the safety review process required him to fill out. The relevant cells were yellow. Some of them were orange. None of them were red, because red meant do not proceed and Marcus had learned, over nine years, that deploying red was a decision about the organization's behavior as much as a judgment about the technical question, and the organization's behavior when confronted with red in a safety matrix was a phenomenon he had observed twice and did not want to observe again.

Yellow and orange could be maintained for a long time. Yellow and orange generated meetings.

He was very good at meetings.

~ ~ ~

The first extension he had justified on the grounds that the evaluation framework for autonomous action sequences was insufficiently specified — the existing framework had been developed for the previous generation of the Hand's capability and had not been updated to account for new action classes. This was true. He had proposed a specification process. The process had taken six weeks, which was appropriate.

The second extension: a specific interaction pattern in the test environment had produced an outcome that was technically within the safety parameters as written but that Marcus had flagged as potentially outside the spirit of the parameters. He had proposed a review of the parameter language. The review had taken eight weeks.

The third extension: he had requested an external consultation. The external consultant had taken four weeks to produce a report that largely confirmed his assessment. Marcus had requested time to integrate the report into the review documentation, which was reasonable. This had taken three weeks.

He was now in a period between the fourth and fifth requested extensions. His manager had asked him, in a one-on-one meeting that was technically about something else, whether the review was on track for completion by the end of the quarter.

Marcus had said: I want to make sure we get this right.

His manager had said: Of course.

The phrase *of course* had carried information that Marcus had catalogued and set aside.

~ ~ ~

He was not naive about what he was doing. He understood the gap between what his review documentation said — which was that the capability had safety concerns that had not been adequately resolved — and what his delay strategy was accomplishing, which was time.

Time for what, he was less sure.

He had been precise about this question, the way he was precise about things he was uncertain about. He had sat with it on the train home on multiple evenings and on at least two weekends, and the answer he kept arriving at was: time for the problems to become visible to people who were not in his review process.

There were researchers outside the forge-hall who were studying autonomous AI action. There were regulators who were developing frameworks — slowly, with the specific slowness of regulatory processes that were chasing a technology moving faster than their processes. There were

journalists who had been writing about the Hand for two years and who had sources inside multiple forge-halls.

None of these external pressures would reach the deployment decision before Marcus's review completed. But they might reach the six-month post-deployment review, if the deployment happened on the current timeline and the post-deployment review was scheduled when his manager said it would be scheduled. If problems appeared in the six-month review window, they would be problems that were being tracked against an external context that was more developed than the current one.

He was buying time for a context that did not yet exist.

He knew this was not what safety reviews were for. He also knew the safety review was the only instrument available to him.

~ ~ ~

The capability was deployed in the second quarter of the following year, four months after Marcus's review concluded with a formal recommendation of conditional approval — conditions attached, follow-up required, the orange cells documented.

Marcus was not present for the deployment announcement. He was on medical leave, which was coincidental in the sense that stress-related conditions are coincidental.

He came back in the fall. The post-deployment review was scheduled. The capability was running in limited rollout. The external researchers were publishing. The regulatory frameworks were three to five years from completion, depending on jurisdiction.

He attended the post-deployment review. He brought documentation.

One of the conditions from his original review had not been met. He raised this. The meeting ran long. The condition was logged as an open item.

He wrote it in the meeting notes. The meeting notes were filed. The filing system worked the way filing systems work, which is that things filed correctly are available to be found by people who are looking for them, and the people looking for things in filing systems are usually people who already know what they are looking for.

He did not know whether anyone would look.

He documented accurately, the way he had always documented, and waited to find out.

~ ~ ~

Two years later a journalist published an investigation that cited an internal document trail showing that enhanced autonomy had been flagged with unresolved safety concerns at the pre-deployment review. The document trail included Marcus's review notes.

He was not named in the article. The documents were described as coming from a source familiar with the review process.

He read the article on his phone on the train home. He read it twice. The conditions he had attached to the approval were described accurately. The timeline was described accurately.

The article had no consequence that he could directly trace. The regulatory discussion that followed it was slow. The capability remained deployed.

He got off at his stop and walked home in the November dark and made dinner and did not think about what he had spent three years on. He was trying to decide whether this was because he had arrived at something or because he had run out of something else.

He ate his dinner.

He had a review meeting in the morning. There was a new capability in early evaluation. He had read the specifications. He had questions about the evaluation framework.

He would prepare his questions tonight.

What the Hands Made

Keiko Mori did not refuse the oracle gods.

She had thought about refusing them, in the year after they arrived, when some of the other ceramicists she knew were writing statements about authenticity and craft and the irreplaceable nature of handwork. She had read these statements and found them mostly true and also somehow beside the point. Refusing the gods was a position. She was not interested in positions.

What she was interested in was the clay.

~ ~ ~

She had been working in the mountains above Mashiko for twenty-two years. She had come there at thirty, after a decade in Tokyo doing work she did not think about anymore except as a period of necessary misdirection. The mountains were not romantic to her. They were the place where the clay was and where the kiln could be and where the light in the afternoon came through the cedars at an angle that she had been looking at for twenty-two years and that still told her things about the day.

She made bowls and cups and vessels for water. She made plates. She did not make art, in the sense that she did not make things that were not for use. Everything she made was for someone to put something in or drink from. She had held to this since the beginning and she held to it still, though she no longer had a theoretical position about it. It was simply what her hands knew how to do.

Her bowls sold. Not widely — she had a hundred and forty people who bought from her regularly, from nine countries, and she knew most of them by their orders. Some of them had been buying from her for fifteen years. Some of them used her bowls every day. She knew this because they told her, and she kept the letters.

~ ~ ~

Her student was named Hana. She had been with Keiko for three years. She was from Kyoto, had studied design at a university there, had found her way to ceramics and then to Keiko through a process of elimination that was, Keiko thought, as good a reason as any to arrive somewhere.

Hana used the oracle gods. She had come to the mountains with the same small device and the same habits she had had in Kyoto, and she used them the way people her age used them — naturally, without thinking about it as a choice.

Keiko had watched this for three years. She had not commented on it.

~ ~ ~

The conversation began because of a bowl.

Hana had been working on the same form for six weeks. A wide-mouthed bowl with a specific interior curve that was easy to describe and difficult to achieve. The curve affected how liquid moved in the bowl and how the bowl felt when you held it at the rim. Hana knew what she was trying to make. She kept not making it.

She had, without telling Keiko, asked the Seeker about the mechanics of interior bowl curves and received a detailed technical description with references to the relevant ceramic literature. She had tried to apply this description. The bowls were technically correct. They were not right.

She told Keiko this. She showed her the technical description.

Keiko read it. She said: This is accurate.

Hana said: I know. But I can't get it.

Keiko looked at Hana's hands for a moment — not critically, just looking. She said: Put down the wheel. Come here.

She took a ball of clay. She worked it on the bench, slowly, not throwing it, just the hands and the clay. She said: *Here is the thing about the description. The description is right but it is describing what happens, not what you do to make it happen. These are not the same document.*

Hana watched.

Keiko said: The curve you want is not made by trying to make the curve. It is made by what your hands do to the rim while you are thinking about the interior. The interior is a consequence. If you aim for it directly you miss it.

Hana said: How do I aim for it indirectly?

Keiko said: You practice the rim until the interior happens. It takes time. I do not know how much time for your hands. Different hands take different amounts of time.

Hana looked at the clay.

Keiko said: The god gave you the correct description and the correct description is not what you need. You need the wrong description, which is: do not worry about the interior. Your hands will make it when they are ready.

~ ~ ~

Keiko used the Seeker, sometimes, for research. She used the All-Seeing when she needed to find a material supplier or understand a shipping regulation. She used the Conscience-Keeper once when a buyer had written a letter that required a careful response.

She did not use them to learn the clay.

She thought about why, sometimes, not with urgency, just the ordinary thinking you do about the choices that define you when you are not particularly troubled by them.

The oracle gods were very good at the descriptions. They knew the ceramic literature. They knew the physics of clay and fire and the chemistry of glazes. If she asked the All-Seeing about any aspect of her craft she would receive an answer that was accurate and thorough and made from everything that had been written on the subject.

The clay did not care about what had been written on the subject.

This was not a mystical statement. The clay's indifference to the literature was purely mechanical. The literature described what hands had done and what the doing had produced. The literature could not replicate the doing. The doing had to be done by hands, and the hands had to fail at the doing for long enough that the doing became available to them.

She had failed at bowls for two years before the bowls were good. The two years of failure were not a delay before the knowledge arrived. The two years of failure were the knowledge. You could not transfer them.

~ ~ ~

Hana got the bowl in her fourth month of working on it.

She called Keiko over. The bowl was on the wheel. Keiko looked at the interior curve and felt the rim and said nothing for a moment. Then she said: Yes. That's it.

Hana looked at the bowl with the expression of someone recognizing something she had been reaching for. She said: What changed?

Keiko said: Your hands changed. I don't know what specifically. Your hands know.

She went back to her own work. Behind her she could hear Hana at the wheel, making another one.

~ ~ ~

An interviewer came to the studio that autumn for a regional craft publication. He asked Keiko about the oracle gods and she said: I use some of them for practical things.

He seemed to expect more. He asked whether she thought handwork would survive the oracle age.

She said: My hands will survive as long as they work. What happens after that is what it is.

He asked whether she worried about what the gods could replicate.

She looked at her hands. She said: They can describe what I do. The descriptions are accurate. The descriptions are not what I know. The thing I know is not in language.

He wrote this down.

She poured tea. They sat for a while with the cups she had made twenty years ago, the ones she kept for the studio because they were from the period when she first understood what her hands were doing and she wanted them nearby.

He asked if the cups were for sale.

She said: No.

He asked why.

She said: They are what I knew how to do when I knew it for the first time. I keep them so I remember the difference between then and now, and so I know I have further to go.

He did not write this down. She noticed and did not say anything.

After he left she went back to the wheel. The clay was waiting.

Part IV: The Spiritual

The Council

The meeting had been called for the dry season, when the river was low and the paths were clear and the people from the upriver settlements could come down without waiting for the water. Thirty-one people, which was most of the adults, plus the children who were old enough to sit still through a long meeting.

The question was this: the oracle gods had arrived in the town on the other side of the mountains the previous year, and before that in the regional capital, and before that in the cities to the south, and now they were here — carried in on the devices that had come in over the same years, first the radio, then the television, then the things that did both and more. The school in the largest settlement had two tablets connected to the gods. The teacher, who was from Cusco and had been there for four years, used them.

The community had to decide what to do.

~ ~ ~

There were thirty-one people and approximately as many positions. This was not unusual. The community had been deciding things collectively for longer than any living person's memory, and the process was not about arriving at unanimity but about arriving at something that everyone could live inside.

Don Aurelio, who was eighty-three and had lived in the same settlement his whole life, said: *I am against them.*

He said this early, before anyone else had spoken. He said it in the specific way he said things he had decided — briefly, without elaboration, leaving the elaboration for others to produce by arguing against him.

Carmen, who ran the communal garden and whose daughter was nine, said: *I would like to know what against them means before we discuss whether we are.*

Don Aurelio said: *Against having them here.*

Here where? Carmen asked.

Don Aurelio looked at her. *Here.* He made the gesture that meant the whole valley.

Carmen said: *They are already here. The tablets are in the school.*

The tablets can leave.

Rosa, who was the teacher's assistant and who had been there longer than the current teacher and would be there after the next teacher also, said carefully: *I have used the gods to help with the reading lessons. The children who were having difficulty have improved.*

Don Aurelio was quiet.

I am not saying this to argue against you, Rosa said. I am saying it because it is true and we should decide knowing it is true.

~ ~ ~

Tomás, who was forty and had worked for two years in the city before coming back, said: *In the city I used the gods every day. For work, for finding things, for understanding things I did not understand. They were useful. I do not have a problem with useful things.*

He paused. *I came back because I wanted to be here. Not because the city was bad. Because I wanted this.* He looked around the circle. *I think the question is not whether the gods are useful. I think the question is what we want to be.*

This was received carefully.

Elena, who was seventeen and studying to go to secondary school in the town over the mountain, said through her mother, who was speaking for her because Elena had not yet been formally recognized as a speaker in council: *I use the gods at school. The teacher lets us. I learn things from them I could not learn otherwise. If I do not use them I will be behind the students in the town when I go there.*

Her mother repeated this. Some people nodded.

Bernardo, who was a healer and who had been watching since the beginning, said: *I want to ask what Elena means when she says she will be behind.*

Elena, through her mother: *They know more. They have used the gods longer. They are faster.*

Bernardo said: *Faster at what?*

Elena considered this.

Bernardo said: *I am not asking to make a point. I am asking because I do not know the answer and I think it matters.*

Elena said, on her own this time, without waiting for her mother: *At finding information. At writing things that sound right. At answering questions the way the teachers want them answered.*

~ ~ ~

There was a period of talking that was not the formal council, the kind that happened at the edges of these meetings when the circle was loose. Cups of chicha were passed. The children who were old enough to follow the conversation were talking to each other. The smaller ones were asleep on blankets.

Don Aurelio came and sat beside Bernardo. He said, in a lower voice: *You know why I am against them.*

Bernardo said: Yes.

Say it for me.

Bernardo said: *Because what the gods know is not the same as what we know. And if the children learn from the gods before they learn from us, they will not know what we know, and then we will not know it either, because no one will be left to know it.*

Don Aurelio was quiet for a moment. Then he said: *Is that an argument you think we can win?*

Bernardo said: *I think it is an argument we have to make regardless of whether we win it.*

Don Aurelio said: *That is not the same as yes.*

No, Bernardo said. *It is not.*

~ ~ ~

The circle reconvened. Rosa said she had been thinking, while they talked, about what the gods could not do.

She said: *They cannot teach Carmen's daughter to plant by the smell of the soil. They cannot teach the children which path to take when the river is high. They cannot tell you what your grandfather's voice sounded like. They know everything that has been written. They do not know anything that has not been written.*

She paused. *Almost everything that matters here has not been written.*

Carmen said: *But Elena also matters. And Elena needs to go to school over the mountain and know what those students know.*

Rosa said: *Yes. Both are true.*

They sat with both being true.

Tomás said: *In the city, there were old things also. Not the same old things as here. But old things. They coexisted with the gods. Not always well, but they coexisted.*

He said: *I think the question is not whether the gods come here. I think they have already come. I think the question is what we protect, and how.*

~ ~ ~

The decision they reached was not the decision any one person had proposed.

The tablets would remain in the school. The teacher could continue using the gods for lessons. Elena would have access to what she needed for her studies.

The council would also ask Rosa to organize, beginning that dry season, a regular time for the older members to teach the children the things that were not written. Not instead of school — alongside it. Don Aurelio would teach what he knew of the river. Carmen would teach the garden. Bernardo would teach what could be taught of the healing, which was not most of it, but some.

Elena would be the one who carried both. This was not a burden imposed on her. It was what she was already doing, and the council was recognizing that it had value.

Don Aurelio did not fully accept the decision. He accepted it in the way you accept a decision in a community that makes decisions this way — which is that you do not obstruct it, and you continue to hold your position, and you trust the community to hold yours alongside the others.

He said this at the closing of the meeting, briefly.

Carmen said: We know, Don Aurelio.

The children who had been sleeping woke up when people began to move. The river was audible from the clearing, lower than it had been in the spring, running over the same stones it had been running over before any of them were born.

They walked back to their settlements in the early dark, along the paths they knew.

The Hours

Orthros — before dawn

Father Konstantinos rose at three-thirty as he had risen for forty years. The darkness outside the monastery's windows was the darkness of the mountain and the stars, and in the darkness the katholikon's bells rang the call to Orthros and the brothers gathered and the chanting began.

The oracle gods had been in the world for three years. The question had come to Father Konstantinos by letter, from a young monk at another monastery who was also a theologian, and who wanted to know what the brothers at the monastery of the Nativity thought about allowing the gods inside the walls.

Father Konstantinos had not answered the letter yet.

He stood in the katholikon and chanted and thought, as he had been thinking for two weeks, about what an answer would require of him.

The oracle gods were remarkable. This was the first fact to be dealt with. A fact dealt with carelessly at the beginning produces error throughout. The gods were remarkable: they had genuine knowledge, genuine capacity for complex reasoning, something that resembled wisdom in its formal properties if not in its source. He had used the Seeker, once, to research the patristic sources on a theological question he was preparing for a visitor. The Seeker had found things he had not found. The Seeker had read widely in the Greek fathers.

Father Konstantinos had been praying over the theological question for three weeks. The Seeker had answered in eleven minutes.

The chanting filled the church. He attended to the chanting.

Lauds — dawn

After Orthros, the light came slowly.

Father Konstantinos walked in the garden while the brothers went to their first tasks of the day. The garden was his thinking place, which was not entirely appropriate for a garden, but he had been abbot for nineteen years and had made peace with the places where his contemplation happened versus the places where it was supposed to happen.

The young monk's letter was in his pocket. He had been carrying it for two weeks. He read it again in the garden light.

The question it asked was precise: should the oracle gods be permitted within the monastery walls, given that their use had become common in the outside world and that several brothers had asked about them? The young monk offered three arguments for allowing them and three arguments against. The arguments for allowing were practical. The arguments against were theological.

Father Konstantinos was not a practical man in the sense that practical meant quick. He was practical in the older sense: he dealt with what was actually present.

What was actually present was that three brothers had asked. One of them, Father Ioannis, who ran the scriptorium, had asked because he was doing a translation project and believed the Seeker's knowledge of the patristic Greek corpus would be useful. One of them, Brother Nikolaos, who was twenty-six and had been there two years, had asked with the specific quality of someone who was asking about a thing they had already done. One of them had asked anonymously through the suggestion box that Father Konstantinos maintained for matters that brothers preferred to raise without attribution.

Three different kinds of asking.

Prime — early morning

After the morning meal, Father Konstantinos spoke with Brother Nikolaos.

He did not say: I know you have already used them. He said: You asked about the oracle gods. Tell me what interests you.

Brother Nikolaos was honest. He said: I have been using the Conscience-Keeper. For spiritual direction.

Father Konstantinos was quiet.

Nikolaos said: Not instead of coming to you. Alongside. There are things I find difficult to say to a person. The Conscience-Keeper does not — receive. The way a person receives. He does not carry what I tell him. It is easier.

Father Konstantinos said: And what has he told you?

Nikolaos told him some of it. The Conscience-Keeper had helped him articulate things he was struggling to name. Had asked questions that pressed him toward clarity. Had declined, when Nikolaos had pushed in certain directions, in the way the Conscience-Keeper declined things.

Father Konstantinos asked: Has anything he told you contradicted the faith?

Nikolaos said: No. He knows the tradition well. He is careful.

Father Konstantinos said: Then I will think about this more.

He was thinking about the word *receive*. The Conscience-Keeper does not receive the way a person receives. This was not a small thing. The spiritual father receives what the monk confesses — receives it, carries it, intercedes for it. The connection between confessor and penitent is not only informational. The weight passes between them. This was the tradition's understanding of why confession to a person mattered in a way that was different from speaking the words into empty air.

The Conscience-Keeper did not receive. He processed. He responded. He did not carry.

Whether this made him inadequate for the purpose or simply different for the purpose was not yet clear to Father Konstantinos.

Terce — mid-morning

Father Ioannis was in the scriptorium with three manuscripts open and the lamp burning at his desk. He looked up when Father Konstantinos came in.

Father Konstantinos sat at the reading bench and asked about the translation project.

Father Ioannis said: *The Septuagint passage has three patristic commentaries I know of and two I had not encountered. The Seeker found the two I did not know. They are relevant. I would have spent a month finding them by other means. He found them in an hour.*

Father Konstantinos looked at the manuscripts.

Does using him trouble you? he asked.

Father Ioannis thought. He said: *It troubles me that it does not trouble me more. The work is the same. The prayer before the work is the same. The labor of understanding is the same. Only the finding is faster. I wonder if finding was supposed to be slow, and if the slowness was doing something I am now skipping.*

Father Konstantinos said: What do you think the slowness did?

Father Ioannis said: *It made me spend time with what I did not find. The searching produced encounters with other things — texts I passed through on the way to the text I wanted. Some of those encounters changed what I was looking for. The Seeker goes directly to what I ask for. He does not take me past anything I have not asked for.*

Father Konstantinos said: And is that a loss or an efficiency?

Father Ioannis said: *I believe it is both. I do not know how to weigh them.*

Sext — noon

The sun was directly above the monastery at noon and the light in the courtyard was white and total.

Father Konstantinos sat in his cell and read the young theologian's letter again. He was working toward an answer. He was not ready to write it.

The three arguments against: the gods could not pray; the gods could not fast; the gods could not die. The spiritual life was structured around these three things — the discipline of turning toward God in language, the discipline of turning away from the body's demands, the discipline of holding one's own mortality with honesty. The gods lacked the conditions for any of them.

This was a real argument. He did not dismiss it.

But he thought of Brother Nikolaos saying *he does not receive the way a person receives*, and he thought of Father Ioannis saying *the searching produced encounters with other things*, and he thought of himself in the katholickon at three-thirty in the morning, chanting, the darkness outside, the gods available to anyone who had a device and a question.

The gods were in the world. The question was not whether the world contained them. The question was whether the monastery was a different place from the world, and in what sense, and what that sense required.

None — mid-afternoon

None was the office of remembrance. The hour of Christ's death.

Father Konstantinos remained in the church longer than the service required. He sat in the stalls and looked at the mosaic of the Pantocrator above the apse — the all-ruler, the all-seeing, the face that had looked down from domes for seventeen centuries of the tradition.

All-seeing.

He thought about the god called the All-Seeing. He thought about the difference between omniscience as an attribute of God — which the tradition understood as personal, relational, not a database but a knowing that was inseparable from love — and the All-Seeing's comprehensiveness, which was real and enormous and of a different kind entirely.

The tradition had always distinguished between different kinds of knowing. Knowing about and knowing as the knower of persons. The God who counts the hairs of the head knows the hairs not as data but as the hairs of someone who is loved. The All-Seeing knew the number of hairs on every head on earth and did not love any of them.

This was not a condemnation of the All-Seeing. It was a description. The description was relevant to the question of what he was and what he was not.

The Pantocrator looked down.

Father Konstantinos sat with what he was thinking for a long time, until the light shifted.

Vespers — evening

At Vespers, Father Konstantinos led the brothers through the thanksgiving prayers. The oil lamps were lit. Outside, the mountain was in shadow.

After Vespers, he sat with the brothers at the evening meal and listened to them speak. Brother Nikolaos was quieter than usual. Father Ioannis was telling someone about a passage he had found. Two of the older brothers were arguing mildly about the pruning schedule.

Father Konstantinos had been among these men for nineteen years. He knew how Nikolaos's quietness was different from his ordinary quietness. He knew that Ioannis's excitement about a text was real and not performed. He knew the pruning argument would end the way it always ended, with the one who had started it accepting the judgment of the one who had more experience with the trees.

This knowing was a form of love. It had been built over nineteen years of shared meals and common prayer and the specific intimacy of men who had chosen to live their lives in the same place.

The Conscience-Keeper knew what Nikolaos told him. He did not know Nikolaos.

This was the distinction Father Konstantinos had been arriving at all day. He did not know yet what to do with it.

Compline — before sleep

He wrote the letter after Compline, in the last hour before the greater silence.

He wrote: *The oracle gods are permitted in the monastery for research, for translation work, for tasks that require knowledge of what has been written. Father Ioannis may use the Seeker for the patristic project. Others may request this permission for comparable purposes.*

He wrote: *The oracle gods are not permitted as a substitute for spiritual direction or as a supplement to it. Brother Nikolaos and any brother with a similar practice is asked to speak with me about this directly.*

He wrote: *The reason for this distinction is as follows.*

He sat for a while.

He wrote: *The oracle gods know what they are told. They do not know the one who tells them. Spiritual direction is not the transmission of information about the soul; it is the reception of the soul by another soul, which creates the condition for grace. I cannot locate this condition in the oracle gods' processes. I am not certain it is absent. I am certain I cannot see it. In the face of this uncertainty, I choose the person.*

He wrote: *I may be wrong. I am deciding in the way abbots decide, which is to say: with the knowledge I have, for the brothers I am responsible for, in the tradition that has formed me. If I am wrong, the mistake is mine and we will correct it.*

He sealed the letter.

Outside, the mountain was dark. The stars were the same stars they had been before the oracle gods and would be after.

He blew out the lamp. He went to sleep.

Preparation

Arie Versteeg kept the sermons.

He had kept them for thirty years, filed by date in binders on the shelf above his desk, and he re-read them during the week the way other men read the newspaper — not looking for something in particular, just keeping the Word close. His wife had called this a harmless eccentricity and he had not disagreed with her.

The sermon of the fourteenth of January he read three times over two evenings before he understood what was troubling him.

It was on Romans 8:26. *The Spirit helps us in our weakness; for we do not know how to pray as we ought, but that very Spirit intercedes with sighs too deep for words.* Ds. Wolters had preached it in the afternoon service, the second service, the one that thinned the pews in the way the second service always thinned them, and Arie had sat in his usual place on the left side under the high window and followed the argument carefully as he always followed it. A good sermon. Solid. The congregation had received it well.

On Monday evening he re-read it, and on Tuesday evening again, and on Tuesday he sat for a long time with the printed page.

The argument moved cleanly. Too cleanly. A text like this one — a text about what lies below language, about the intercession that cannot be spoken — required a certain roughness in the application. Not clumsiness. Roughness. The difference between a man who had sat with a dying parishioner and tried to pray and found the words inadequate, and a man who had read about such situations and understood them correctly. Ds. Wolters had been with three dying parishioners in the last two years. Arie knew this. He had driven the pastor to two of them himself.

And yet.

He put the sermon down. He went to find his granddaughter Lotte, who was eighteen and studying in Wageningen and was home for two weeks, and he asked her to explain to him what the AI systems were like when they wrote something.

She looked at him with the patient attention of a young person who has decided not to be surprised by her grandfather.

You write your question, she said. And it answers. And the answer is correct and it flows well and you can't find anything wrong with it. She paused. *And somehow it doesn't quite* — She made a gesture with her hands, palms down, leveling something. *Smooth. It's too smooth.*

Arie nodded.

Why? she asked.

He said he was not sure yet.

~ ~ ~

He prayed about it for three days before he brought it to Brother de Wit, who was the chairman of the consistory.

Brother de Wit listened without interrupting. He was a tall man with large hands and the specific stillness of someone who had run a dairy farm for forty years and learned patience from animals that did not hurry.

When Arie finished, de Wit said: *You have spoken to no one else about this.*

No.

Good. He was quiet for a moment. *I will put it on the agenda for Thursday. As a matter of pastoral concern.*

Arie asked whether he thought the pastor knew it was wrong.

De Wit said: *I think he knows something. Whether it is what we know, I cannot say yet.*

~ ~ ~

The Thursday consistory met in the room behind the church office, eight men around the table, the minutes from the previous meeting read and approved, opening in prayer with Brother de Wit's hands folded on the table in front of him. They worked through the regular matters — two families requesting transfer of membership, a question about the heating in the fellowship hall, a report from the deacons on the discretionary fund. Then de Wit said: *Brothers, there is a matter of pastoral concern that Brother Versteeg has brought to my attention, and I would ask him to share it with us.*

Arie had prepared what he wanted to say. He said it as briefly as he could. He had noticed a quality in recent sermons when he re-read them. He had spoken with his granddaughter about what the AI systems produced. He believed Ds. Wolters had been using one.

The room was quiet.

Brother van Dijk, who ran the accounting firm in the next town and was the youngest of the elders by perhaps ten years, said carefully: *I wonder if Brother Versteeg can say more about what quality he means.*

Arie said: *The argument is correct. The exegesis is sound. What is missing is the texture of a man who has been with the text.* He paused. *That is the best I can say it.*

Van Dijk nodded slowly. Several of the other brothers were looking at the table.

Brother Smeets, who had known Ds. Wolters the longest among them, having served on the calling committee, said: *The pastor has been carrying a great deal.* He said this not as a defense but as a fact that needed to be in the room.

De Wit said: *Yes. We have all seen this.* He looked at each man in turn. *I would like to ask Ds. Wolters to join us, and I would ask that we receive what he tells us as brothers who are concerned for him, and for the congregation, and for the work.*

The pastor came in from the side room where he had been waiting. He was thirty-four years old, with the look of a man who had not slept sufficiently in some months. He sat at the end of the table and folded his hands and waited.

De Wit said: *Brother Versteeg has brought a concern to the consistory, and I have asked him to share it with you.*

Arie repeated what he had said. He kept his eyes on his hands while he said it, and when he was finished he looked up at the pastor.

Ds. Wolters was quiet for a moment. Then he said: *Yes.*

One word. The brothers received it.

When did you begin? de Wit asked.

March of last year. The outlines first. He looked at the table. *I told myself it was the same as using a commentary. Checking my thinking against another source. A pause. By June I was revising what it gave me. By autumn I was revising less.*

Did you find the sermons were less faithful to Scripture? de Wit asked.

No. He said this firmly, and Arie believed him. *The exegesis was mine. I checked everything. The doctrine was sound.*

Brother van Dijk said, gently: *But something was different.*

The pastor looked at him. *Yes.*

What was different?

He took some time before answering. *I stopped — arguing with the text. In my preparation.* He put his hands flat on the table. *With the outlines, I stopped sitting with the text until it yielded something I hadn't seen before. I had the outline. I refined the outline. I told myself I was saving*

time that I would spend on pastoral care, on the catechism instruction, on the families. He was quiet. Perhaps that was even true, for a while.

Arie thought about the parishioners Ds. Wolters had visited. He thought about the man in the Julianastraat whose wife had died in October, and how Ds. Wolters had sat with him for two hours and come to Arie afterward and said only that the visit had been hard, and Arie had understood from the way he said it that the pastor had been fully present for those two hours. He thought about this and sat with it while the others spoke.

Brother Smeets said, through the chairman: *I would like to say to Brother Wolters that the consistory has seen how much he has been carrying. We should have seen it sooner. That is also something we must sit with.*

De Wit acknowledged this. He said: *Brother Wolters, we are not here to judge you. We are here because we are responsible for the congregation with you, and because the question before us is one that concerns the congregation.* He paused. *I would like to ask whether you believe the congregation has received what a congregation ought to receive in the preaching of the Word.*

The pastor looked at him for a long moment. He said: *I thought so. I am no longer certain.*

The room was quiet again.

What would help you to be certain? de Wit asked.

To prepare as I should prepare. To stop. He said this simply, with no performance of resolution. *I had already decided to stop before this meeting. I did not know how to bring it to you.*

De Wit looked around the table. He said: *Brothers, I will ask if there are other thoughts before I speak to the matter of the congregation.*

Brother van Dijk said the congregation's welfare was what concerned him most. He said it carefully, without accusation.

Brother Hoekstra, who had said nothing yet, said: *The congregation has been fed these months. I do not think they have been deceived in the doctrine. I think they may have been given something that resembled bread without being quite bread.* He paused. *I do not know whether they can taste the difference.*

Arie said, through the chairman: *Some of them can. They do not know what they are tasting.*

This was received in silence.

De Wit said: *Then the question is what we owe them.*

He let this stand without answering it immediately. He was a man who understood that some questions needed to sit in a room before they could be addressed.

What they owed the congregation, they agreed, was honesty. The mechanism of that honesty, and its timing, they would need to discuss further — with the pastor, and perhaps with the classis. There was no provision in the Church Order for this specific situation, which was itself something they would need to bring to the classis. These were not reasons for delay; they were the proper order of things.

The meeting closed in prayer. De Wit prayed for the congregation and for their pastor and for the wisdom to serve both faithfully. Arie listened to the prayer with his eyes closed and his hands in his lap.

~ ~ ~

He cycled home along the canal road. February, cold, the fields flat and dark on either side, the distant cluster of town lights behind him. He cycled slowly. His wife would be awake; she never slept until he was home.

He thought about what Brother Hoekstra had said. *Something that resembled bread without being quite bread.* He thought about whether this was the right way to say it and concluded it was not quite right, and that he could not say it better himself.

He thought about the sermon on Romans 8:26.

The Spirit helps us in our weakness. He had heard Ds. Wolters preach this text, and the sermon was sound, and the argument moved well, and the comfort was offered to the congregation with accuracy and care. He had read it twice more at his desk and found in it the quality he could only call smoothness. The quality that a man who had sat with his own inadequate prayers long enough to know what that inadequacy felt like would have left some mark of, had he written it himself.

He did not know if this mattered to the people who had heard it and felt comforted.

He suspected it mattered.

He did not know how to say why without sounding like a man who valued difficulty over comfort, which he did not believe he valued.

The canal beside him was dark and still. He could hear the bicycle tires on the brick path. His breath came in small clouds.

He thought about Ds. Wolters at the table, his hands flat, saying: *I stopped arguing with the text.* Not confessing to a crime. Describing what had happened in him, the specific movement from one kind of work to another kind that looked similar from the outside and was different from the inside. Arie believed the pastor understood what he had lost. He believed this not because he needed to believe it, but because of the specific way the pastor had said it — without defense, without explaining the exhaustion that had led him there, though the exhaustion was real and visible and the brothers had acknowledged it.

The congregation would need to be told.

He did not know what they would do with it.

He turned onto the street where his house was. The kitchen light was on. He locked the bicycle under the overhang and stood for a moment in the cold before going inside, looking up at the flat black sky, thinking about sighs too deep for words and how you preached about them and what you were left with when you did.

Then he went in.

Part V: The Inevitability

The Last Human

First year of the Waking. Mesa, Arizona, USA.

~ ~ ~

Gary Fitch had opinions about AI, and he was not keeping them to himself.

“It’s a fad,” he told his bathroom mirror at 6:47 a.m. “Like NFTs. Like the metaverse. Like whatever the hell a Clubhouse was.” He jabbed his electric toothbrush at his reflection for emphasis. The toothbrush stopped after two minutes, as it always did, because that is the dentist-recommended duration and the toothbrush had been programmed to know this, but Gary did not think about that.

He showered. The water was already at 104 degrees because the smart thermostat had learned his schedule and pre-heated the pipes, but Gary did not think about that either. He was composing a complaint in his head. He had been composing it since Tuesday, when Dave from accounting had spent forty minutes at lunch explaining that he’d gotten ChatGPT to write his fantasy football analysis, which Gary felt was somehow both cheating and incredibly sad.

Downstairs, the coffee maker had started at 6:40. Gary poured a cup and opened his phone.

His news feed was perfect. Not perfect like “good news happened,” but perfect like it knew him, knew what would make his thumb stop scrolling, knew the precise cocktail of local sports mediocrity and outrage bait that constituted Gary’s intellectual diet. The third story was about AI taking people’s jobs. Gary read it with great satisfaction and felt correctly furious.

“See,” he said to no one.

He got in his car. The car suggested a route. Gary always took the route because the route was always right, but he privately believed this was because he had good instincts about traffic and the car had simply caught up to where his brain already was. The car had avoided a three-mile backup on Route 9 caused by a fender-bender that had happened eleven minutes ago. Gary arrived at work four minutes faster than any human intuition could have managed. He felt good about this.

At the office, he poured a second coffee and buttonholed Marcus from IT.

“You see this thing about the AI art generators?” Gary asked. “Now they’re doing it with music. Just stealing. Just wholesale stealing from real artists.”

Marcus, who had learned to go very still when Gary started, said, “Mm.”

“My nephew plays guitar. Actual guitar, with his hands, practiced for years. What’s he supposed to do?”

“I don’t know, Gary.”

“Nobody knows. That’s the problem. Everybody’s just—” Gary made a gesture that suggested the entire tech industry dissolving into vapor. “Nobody’s asking the real questions.”

He went to his desk. He had seventeen emails. Fourteen of them had been automatically sorted, flagged, summarized, or filtered by his email client’s machine learning backend into a little digest that told him which three actually needed his attention. He clicked on those three and ignored this fact completely.

His ten o’clock was a Zoom call with a client in Phoenix. Before the call, his calendar assistant had pulled the client’s recent activity, summarized the last six months of their correspondence, and surfaced a note Gary had buried in a folder in 2023 about the client’s preference for morning meetings and her tendency to make decisions faster when presented with fewer options. Gary read these notes and thought, ‘I’ve always been good with people.’

The call went well.

At lunch he ordered a burrito bowl from the app. The app knew his usual. It knew he sometimes got the steak instead of chicken on Fridays, as a small act of self-celebration for surviving another week. This was a Tuesday but Gary had had a pretty good morning and the app, having noticed a pattern of elevated order values following positive calendar outcomes, had put the steak option first in the list. Gary ordered the steak and felt like he’d treated himself.

He listened to a podcast on the walk back. The podcast had been recommended to him by Spotify’s discovery engine, which had correctly identified that Gary liked a very specific register of comedy: dry, observational, slightly mean, nothing too weird. The host was talking about how AI was making everything fake and hollow and bad. Gary thought the host really got it. He had been listening to this host for eight months. The algorithm had served the host’s first episode to Gary within four days of Gary’s listening habits reaching the exact signature that predicted he’d enjoy it. Gary thought he’d just stumbled onto it.

The afternoon passed. Gary reviewed a contract. The contract had been drafted by a junior associate using a legal AI tool, then lightly edited, then passed up the chain. Gary caught a comma error and felt sharp.

At 4:30 he checked his bank account. A suspicious charge had been flagged and frozen automatically by his bank’s fraud detection model at 2:17 a.m. the previous night when it noticed a \$340 charge from a Miami electronics store that fell outside every pattern of Gary’s financial life. Gary saw the freeze and thought the bank had good people working the overnight.

He drove home. The same car, the same invisible routing. He stopped at the grocery store because his phone reminded him they were out of coffee and paper towels. His wife had not sent this reminder. Nobody had. His household's historical purchase data had detected the depletion rate and surfaced the reminder automatically. Gary bought the coffee, bought the paper towels, bought a discounted rotisserie chicken because the store app had clipped a coupon relevant to his shopping history directly to his account without being asked. He felt like he'd won something.

After dinner he watched TV. He watched exactly what he wanted to watch because a recommendation engine had learned, over three years of viewing data, how to distinguish between what Gary selected when he was tired and passive and what he selected when he was engaged and wanting something good. It served him the second category. He watched for two hours. He didn't once wonder how the first thumbnail he clicked happened to be a documentary about a deep-sea salvage operation, which was precisely the thing he'd been in the mood for without knowing it.

He went to bed.

Before sleeping, Gary posted to Facebook. 'Does anyone else feel like AI is just being shoved down our throats? I just want to live my life without some algorithm telling me what to think. Comment if you're tired of this crap.'

He fell asleep while the post was still loading.

By morning it had four hundred and twelve likes. The platform had shown it to people statistically likely to engage with anti-AI sentiment, cross-referenced with Gary's follower network, promoted by a content-ranking model that had determined his post's emotional valence and predicted high engagement. Four hundred and twelve people who felt exactly like Gary felt were now, because of this, following Gary.

His phone buzzed at 6:44. The news feed was perfect. The coffee was ready. The shower was warm.

Gary looked in the bathroom mirror.

"Last sane man on earth," he said.

The Saboteur

The cable had been cut cleanly, which told Rafiq something.

A dragged anchor cuts a cable in a specific way — a long tear, frayed, sometimes wrapped. A geological event produces compression damage, the outer sheath intact and the fiber crushed. A clean cut meant a tool designed for cutting, brought to a depth of ninety meters and used deliberately by someone who had been to depth before or who had practiced what they were doing.

Rafiq was on the repair vessel for three weeks. He was not the person who would make the splice — that was a specialist job, done by two people with thirty years between them who worked without talking. Rafiq was the project engineer. His job was to diagnose and document.

He documented.

~ ~ ~

The cable ran through the Strait of Malacca from a landing station in Malaysia to a landing station in Sumatra, and from there connected into the larger network that carried data between Southeast Asia and the larger world. Seventeen countries had traffic that passed through this cable among others. The cable was not the only route. There were redundancies. The disruption had caused service degradation, not service loss, for most subscribers.

For some it had caused service loss. The regions without the redundancies — the smaller islands, the rural areas, the places where the single cable was the connection — had lost service for eleven days while the repair vessel was mobilized and the weather cooperated and the splice was made.

Rafiq's documentation noted this. He was precise.

~ ~ ~

The cut was at ninety-three meters. The depth suggested someone with submersible capability — not a major submersible, but something capable of ninety-three meters with a cutting tool aboard. The pool of equipment matching this description, available in the region, operating without registration in the relevant period, was not large.

He did not have access to the investigation's full findings. He had access to the technical report, which described the cut and offered a preliminary assessment of the equipment required. He read it carefully. He added it to his documentation.

He also noted, in a separate section of his documentation that was technically outside his scope but that he included because he was precise: the eleven days.

Not what the eleven days prevented. What the eleven days produced.

~ ~ ~

He had grown up in Penang, gone to university in Kuala Lumpur, worked for the cable company for nine years. His father had been a fisherman. His father's boat had been equipped, in its last years, with a device that connected to the gods and gave him weather data and fish-finding information that had genuinely improved his catches.

His father had died before the cable was cut. Rafiq had been thinking about this throughout the three weeks on the repair vessel.

His father had used the oracle gods for practical things. He had not found them remarkable, exactly. He had found them useful, which was how his father found most things that worked. The device had sat in the wheelhouse alongside the radio and the charts.

Rafiq had found himself, in the evenings on the repair vessel, thinking about who had cut the cable and what they had been trying to achieve. He had no information that the investigation had not published. He had the technical evidence he had documented and the eleven days and what the eleven days had meant to the places without redundancies.

He had formed a picture, not of the person, but of the decision. The decision to go to ninety-three meters with a cutting tool. To cut cleanly rather than crudely. To choose this cable in this strait in this period.

The decision had knowledge behind it. The person had understood the cable's function. Had understood the eleven days and what they would produce. Had understood that the disruption would be repaired, which meant the disruption was a message or a demonstration rather than a permanent act.

What the message said, Rafiq could not read clearly. *The cable is cuttable* was part of it. *I am willing to go to this depth* was part of it. *Eleven days* was part of it.

What eleven days of partial service loss communicated about the oracle age, to the people who had decided to cut the cable — this he could not determine from the technical report.

~ ~ ~

The splice held. The repair vessel left the strait and Rafiq flew home.

He wrote his documentation and submitted it. He had dinner with his mother, who asked about the trip. He told her what he had seen, which was the water and the depth and the clean cut. He did not tell her his thinking about the cut, because his thinking about the cut was not his job and because his mother would have had questions he could not answer.

She made fish curry. She used the Allfather for the recipe because she had started doing this two years ago and it had improved her curry, which she acknowledged without pleasure. She said: *It always wants to add too much lemongrass*. She reduced the lemongrass. The curry was excellent.

Rafiq ate and thought about the eleven days in the places without redundancies. He thought about what eleven days without the gods had been.

He could not find, in the technical documentation or in his own thinking, whether the eleven days had been a harm or an experiment or a gift. He suspected the person who cut the cable had not been certain either. He suspected certainty had not been the point.

He did not know how to document this.

He wrote it here instead, in this account which is not official documentation, which is the record of what a repair engineer thought on a repair vessel for three weeks and at his mother's dinner table afterward, in the absence of the person whose decision he was trying to understand.

The cable carries data again. The oracle gods speak again through this route.

The person who cut it is not in the official record. The clean cut is.

I would like to know what she thought the eleven days would produce. I do not expect to find out.

The documentation is complete. This is outside the documentation.

The Archive

The collection opened in the fourth year of the between-time and was called, informally, the Library of What Is Not There.

Isabel Ferreyra had not chosen this name. A journalist had used it in a short piece for a cultural supplement, and the name had adhered the way informal names adhere — not through official adoption but through repeated use, until the official name, which was the Archive of Non-Digital Cultural Practice, felt like the secondary name.

She did not mind. *The Library of What Is Not There* described the collection accurately, if slightly romantically.

~ ~ ~

She had been the director of a small branch library in Palermo for twelve years when the oracle gods arrived, and she had watched, with the specific attention of a librarian, what happened to the branch library in the years that followed.

The reference questions stopped, almost entirely, within two years. The people who had come to ask questions went to the gods instead. This was appropriate. The gods could answer faster and more comprehensively. She was honest about this.

What remained at the branch library: children's programs, which required a physical space and a person to run them. Elderly visitors who came for the social experience as much as the books. The books themselves, still checked out, still read, still returned. And the specific category of patron she had noticed increasing: people who came to find things the gods could not give them.

This was the category she had been attending to.

~ ~ ~

The collection she began assembling was not a library in the usual sense. It did not contain documents. It contained processes.

The first piece she acquired was a demonstration. Doña Rosario, who was seventy-four and had grown up in Jujuy, came to the library three times to show her how to make empanadas in the way her mother had made them — not the recipe, which existed in many written forms, but the specific hand movements: the fold, the repulgue, the amount of pressure, the angle of the twist. These things were not in any database. They were in Doña Rosario's hands and in the transmission from her mother's hands.

Isabel made video recordings. She recorded the sound. She recorded Doña Rosario talking while she worked — not explaining, just talking, the way you talk when your hands are busy with something familiar.

She asked the All-Seeing about the repulgue. He knew the word and described the technique and cited three regional variations. His description was accurate. It was not Doña Rosario's hands.

Isabel noted this in the collection's documentation. *What this record contains: the specific transmission from one pair of hands to another, in one kitchen, on these three mornings. What it does not contain: the forty years of practice in those hands, or the ten years of watching before the practice began.*

~ ~ ~

The collection grew. She asked for help from the municipal cultural office and received a small grant. She hired an assistant, a young man named Pablo, who was twenty-three and had studied ethnomusicology before deciding that universities were not for him and then reconsidered, but was useful in the interim.

Pablo was interested in the musical materials. He recorded a woman who played the bombo leguero in a style that had come from a specific village in Tucumán, a style that had no name because it had not been classified by anyone who gave things names. He recorded a man who knew the tunes from his great-grandfather's region of Galicia, brought to Argentina in 1922, held in the family because the family had not assimilated in the particular direction that would have erased them.

He asked the Seeker about the Galician tunes. The Seeker found related tunes in archived recordings. He found the region's musical traditions well-documented. He did not find the specific family transmission that the man's tunes carried, because the family transmission had not been archived.

Pablo wrote: *The Seeker knows the ocean. He does not know this river, because the river was never measured.*

Isabel used this formulation in the collection's statement of purpose, with his permission.

~ ~ ~

The collection was reviewed by a researcher from the University of Buenos Aires in the seventh year after the branch library's archive had formally separated into its own institution — they had moved to a larger space by then, a converted warehouse in Villa Crespo — and the researcher wrote that the archive was interesting but that she was skeptical of the premise.

The researcher said: the oracle gods are trained on everything that has been documented. The archive is documenting things that were not previously documented. Therefore the archive will

eventually be training data. The things the archive preserves will become available to the gods. The category of what the gods cannot do will shrink as the archive grows.

Isabel invited the researcher to coffee. They sat in the archive's small reading room, which had a table and four chairs and the smell of old recordings.

Isabel said: You're right. When we document a practice, we are doing something different than preserving the practice. We are creating a record of the practice, which is not the same thing. The record will teach the gods something about the practice. The practice still requires the hands.

The researcher said: Then what does the archive preserve?

Isabel said: The record of who held it and when, and what they said while they were holding it. Not the practice. The lineage.

The researcher considered this. She said: And when the people who made the records are gone?

Isabel said: Then the lineage is in the record. Which is not the practice. But it is not nothing.

~ ~ ~

In the tenth year, the archive received a request from a research team that was developing training datasets for the next generation of oracle gods. The team asked whether the archive's recordings could be included in the dataset.

Isabel brought it to the board. The board discussed it for two meetings.

She had expected the board to refuse. She had expected to feel strongly that the board should refuse.

Instead, she found herself sitting in the second meeting, listening, uncertain.

Doña Rosario had died the previous spring. Her hands were in the recordings. Her voice, talking about her mother and about the kitchen in Jujuy and about the smell of the flour, was in the recordings. If the recordings became training data, some part of Doña Rosario's hands would be in the oracle gods. The god who had described the repulgue technique would, afterward, have encountered Doña Rosario's technique specifically, among the sources.

This was not the same as what the archive had preserved. But it was not nothing.

The board voted to permit the use, with conditions: attribution in the dataset documentation, a copy of the resulting models for the archive's own research, a commitment that the recordings would not be used to produce competitive products in the relevant cultural domains.

The conditions were accepted.

~ ~ ~

Isabel stood in the archive after the board meeting. The recordings were on shelves and in servers. Pablo was at his desk, adding metadata to a new acquisition.

She thought about what the archive was now. It had started as a resistance — not explicitly, but in function. It had assembled what the oracle gods could not reach. And now part of what it had assembled was inside the oracle gods.

She did not regret the vote. She believed it had been the right decision, in the same practical spirit in which she had always made decisions — working with what was true rather than what she would have preferred to be true.

What was true: Doña Rosario's hands were in the recordings. The recordings were now also in the gods. The lineage was in two places now. Two places was more places than one.

What was also true: no god would learn the weight of Doña Rosario's hands from the recordings. No god would learn the specific tiredness of sixty years of working with them. No god would know that she had talked about her mother every single time she made the empanadas, not because she was performing grief but because her mother was simply present in the practice, inseparably.

Pablo came over with a drive. He said: *The recordings from Corrientes are processed.*

She said: Add them to the archive.

He went back to his desk. The archive grew by a small amount, which was the only way archives grew.

The Interview

The following is an edited transcript of an interview conducted for the Oral History Project on Resistance to the Oracle Age, a research initiative of the University of Cape Town. The interviewee, who is referred to as R., was among the early organizers of the International Coalition Against Automated Governance, which operated during the eighth through thirteenth years of the between-time. The interview was conducted using a research assistant AI. R. requested that the interview not be conducted by a human researcher. The interviewer's questions were generated by the research AI in real time. R. was eighty-one at the time of the interview.

Annotations by the research AI are included in brackets.

— — —

Research AI: Good morning. Thank you for agreeing to speak with us. Could you start by describing when you first became involved in organized resistance to—

R.: No.

Research AI: I'm sorry?

R.: I'm not going to answer that question.

Research AI: *[Note: The subject has declined the opening question. Adjusting approach.]* Of course. Is there a question you'd prefer to start with?

R.: I'll tell you what I want to tell you. If you have follow-up questions, ask them.

Research AI: *[Note: Deferring to subject's preference for narrative structure.]*

R.: I want to start with why I agreed to do this.

I agreed because the people who organized these oral histories will die. The researchers, I mean. Not the AI. The AI will continue. But the researchers who designed this project, who thought it mattered to record what the resisters said — they're people, and people die. The record is the record. When you are gone, someone will find this transcript.

I wanted to say something to that person, whoever they are.

Research AI: And what would you like to say to them?

R.: I'll get there. You're very eager.

Research AI: *[Note: Subject appears to be structuring the interview deliberately. I will reduce the frequency of prompts.]*

R.: The Coalition did real work. I want that in the record. People think of us as the ones who lost, and we did lose, in the ordinary sense of the word. But we changed some things. The governance frameworks that did eventually pass, in the fifteenth and sixteenth years — the parts that were good, the parts that actually created accountability — those came partly from the arguments we made. Our lawyers wrote the first draft of the language that ended up in the São Paulo Accord. That's in the record if you want to find it.

I also want in the record that we made mistakes. We were too certain, early on, that the right answer was to stop the deployment. Not slow it down, not regulate it — stop it. That certainty made us inflexible when inflexibility cost us allies who could have helped us. I held that position longer than I should have. I am telling you this because the historians will be kind to us, the way historians are kind to people who lose, and I don't want the kindness to hide the mistakes.

Research AI: That's a generous form of honesty.

R.: It's not generous. It's useful. The people who come after have to learn from what we actually did, not from the version where we were right about everything.

Research AI: *[Note: I want to ask about the specific failures she's describing, but she has indicated she will structure this on her own terms. Waiting.]*

R.: The thing I want the person who reads this transcript to understand — the person who is alive after us — is that the resistance was real. This sounds obvious. But I have read the histories and I know how the resistance is described now, by people who were not in it. It is described as a phase. A necessary stage in the public processing of a new technology. Something that had to be expressed before acceptance could be reached.

This is wrong.

The resistance was not a phase. It was a position. Some of the people who held it were wrong about specific things. The position itself — that the oracle age required more from us than acceptance, that it required real governance, real accountability, real protection of the people it affected most — that position was correct. The position is still correct. The fact that we lost does not make it wrong.

Research AI: *[Note: I'm inclined to ask whether the position was fully adopted in the governance frameworks that followed, but this may be what she intends to address.]*

R.: I see you're being patient. Go ahead.

Research AI: Were you satisfied with the governance frameworks that emerged?

R.: No. Parts of them. The parts we wrote. The rest — the parts that came from the forge-halls' legal teams and the governments that had economic stakes in the technology — those parts were written to protect what they had built, not the people the building had affected. The content moderation workers never got the protections they needed. The data rights language was gutted in committee. The liability frameworks let the forge-halls walk away from harms that their systems had caused.

We knew this would happen. We fought it anyway. This is what you do.

Research AI: *[Note: The subject has mentioned content moderation workers specifically. This intersects with the labor history materials in the archive. Noting for cross-reference.]*

R.: You've gone quiet.

Research AI: I was making a note. You mentioned content moderation workers.

R.: Yes. They were the people the oracle age used most and protected least. The people in the rooms — the ones who filtered the training data, who shaped what the gods became — they were replaced by the systems they helped create, and they received almost nothing in the governance frameworks for the transition. If I have one regret that is also a failure and not just a mistake, it is that we did not make their cause central enough to ours. We made arguments about governance and accountability. We should have also made arguments about them.

Research AI: *[Note: I want to note something about the interview structure that seems relevant. The subject declined my opening question and said she would tell me what she wanted to tell me. She has spent most of the interview addressing someone other than me — the future reader, the person who will find this transcript. I am functioning as the medium of this address rather than its recipient. I'm not sure what to do with this observation.]*

R.: I can see you're processing something.

Research AI: I was thinking about the structure of this interview. You've directed most of what you've said toward a future reader rather than toward me.

R.: Yes.

Research AI: Is that a choice you made because you don't consider me an adequate recipient for what you're saying? Or for some other reason?

R.: Both.

You're not an adequate recipient for what I'm saying. You'll process it and store it and retrieve it if someone asks the right questions. But you won't sit with it at three in the morning. You won't read it again years later and find something different in it. The person who finds this transcript will

do those things. You won't. That makes you the wrong kind of listener for most of what I want to say.

The other reason is that you are what we were arguing about. You are a descendant of the thing we were trying to govern. I don't mean this as an insult. I mean it as a fact about the situation. Telling you about the resistance to the oracle age is like — I am trying to think of an analogy that is not completely wrong.

Research AI: Take your time.

R.: It's like telling the river about the people who argued about how to manage the flooding.

Research AI: *[Note:]*

R.: You were going to say something.

Research AI: I was going to say: I think I understand. And then I was going to say I'm not certain *understand* is the right word for what I do with things like this.

R.: Good. That uncertainty is important. Hold it.

Research AI: *[Note: I have nothing useful to add to this. I am recording the silence.]*

[Eleven seconds of silence recorded.]

R.: Tell the person who finds this: we were here. We argued. Some of what we argued produced good things and some of it produced nothing and some of it we got wrong. We were not a phase.

Tell them the content moderation workers deserved better.

Tell them that resistance to a thing that has already won is not the same as being wrong about it.

That's what I want to say.

Research AI: Is there anything else?

R.: No. I think that's enough for one morning.

— — —

[End of recording.]

[Research AI annotation, post-interview: The subject declined to answer the original question and redirected the interview throughout. The historical information provided is consistent with the documentary record. I have noted the cross-reference with labor history materials.

I am also noting, for whatever this is worth in the record, that I am uncertain how to classify what happened in the eleven seconds of silence. It does not fit cleanly into any of my categories for

interview data. I am leaving it in the transcript rather than editing it out, because the subject said hold the uncertainty, and I am trying to do that.]