- **AI-BCI Superintelligence Engineering Attempts:** As already summarized above, following novel unconventional *EB-creativity*-based cyborgnetic definitions of intelligence developed purely for purposes of self-education, it is impossible for an entity to reliably (i.e. with arbitrary high accuracy) construct an entity which, in relation to that entity appears to be superintelligent. Also, in EB-based creativity, there is *no* advantage to be gained merely via a quantitatively higher speed parameter. On the contrary, an excessive speed may even lead to an epistemic *stasis*, a so-called Cynet Zeno effect (analogous to but different from the Turing paradox and explainable via the requirements for the cooperative infinite game of a [Generative Cyborgnetic Network](#)). A cyborgnet (which is a substrate-independent concept not to be confused with the narrow term of a cyborg) is a *generic* template spanning a directed graph where explanatory narratives combine at least one Type II entity with at least one Type I entity. For this reason, already early humans at the dawn of language count as cyborgnets with language being a primordial technological tool. Obviously, present-day humans, human-based "cyborgs", extinct Homo species and if existent Type II aliens would all represent exemplary instances of cyborgnets too. Since EB-based creativity is linked to fundamentally unpredictable unconscious leaps (linked to the so-called Cynet *Anti*-Zeno effect), there is *no* reason to assume that a *specific* technological tool would guarantee any quantitative advantage. In general, Type II entities can use a multiplicity of possible Type I tools for the purpose of stimulating their creativity. Those tools are by no means limited to inert tools such as present-day Type I AI. For instance, Type I *life* can serve as inspiration too. To sum up, an entity *A* cannot reliably manufacture an entity *B* that appears to be superintelligent in relation to *A*. While it is impossible to control a cyborgnet, cyborgnets including human and human-based cyborgs have a theoretical possibility of value alignment in case of willingness. The AI-extended BCI path, while potentially helpful in some contexts, does *not* guarantee any systematic quantitative advantage in EB-creativity. In the future, the main safety and security risks if one tries to use if for "augmentation" purposes (and not merely for restorative application cases) could e.g. be: a) people's unintentional overreliance on the AI-aided BCI strongly diminishes their epistemic agency and their creativity, b) malevolent people exploit the AI-BCIs post-deployment, c) malicious actors misguidedly convice people to use AI-BCIs in order to become "superintelligent" with the hidden goal to epistemically weaken those via these very BCIs. (These three exemplary risks hold analogously when it comes to epistemic self-sabotage via overreliance on present-day AI, attacks on overreliantly used present-day AI conducted by malicious actors and epistemic incapacitation of adversaries by encouraging overreliance on present-day AI.) In present-day humanity, the wish to find a shortcut to improved creativity/intelligence seems to emerge permanently. However, in EB-creativity, it becomes manifest that there is no shorter path than *to understand*.