

Brain-Machine Interface: Application of Pre-emptive Policies

Nicholas S. Caudill

Automated Intelligence Community College

ai2c.info

23 October 2024

Gifts are accepted by the author at the Bitcoin address (left) and Litecoin address (right):



Introduction

Imagine combining the brain-machine interface Neuralink, the large-language model Grok, and a personalized/customized system of logic with the goal of improving thinking by adopting subtle automation that might “course correct” thoughts that go astray from one’s preferable system of reasoning. Grok could “read the thoughts and conform them to a personalized logical calculus” and then Neuralink could “overwrite neurons before one becomes conscious of their own thoughts.” Essentially, Grok/Neuralink could read and correct thoughts before one “becomes aware of those thoughts” due to the latency of neurons traveling through biological mediums (viz. pure electricity transfers information 300 million times faster).

Body

Consider how many calories are spent manually applying awareness to thoughts in one’s inner dialogue and requiring one to habitually reinforce those more desirable thoughts. It would be better to have a system that filters thoughts so calories aren’t wasted on rehabitualizing the mind. The filter would be customized by the user, not a biased tech company (which would be dystopian as well).

To illustrate how Grok might apply, imagine prompting the model with the firing statistics of one’s neurons instead of the typed text in a chatbox. Grok should be able to distill words and phrases (thoughts and intent) from such neuron-firing statistics. Consider this rough example prompt: “Grok, decipher neuron firing statistics or 10101010010. Next, apply this policy to change what information the conscious mind receives: If word = cat, change to dog.”

By using Neuralink to stimulate neurons to make the inner dialogue of one’s mind to always hear ‘dog’ instead of ‘cat,’ this policy could be applied to allow one to become maximally virtuous at most times, depending on how virtue is defined and how the policy is designed.

One could almost think of this outlined scenario as training one’s mind to think like a sophisticated Monte Carlo artificial intelligence system. It is like bootstrapping the mind and forcing the mind to apply the same logic that makes Tesla’s autopilot work. It is like imagining one’s favorite software algorithm and autonomously forcing the biological brain to conform to that algorithm. One might jump several orders of magnitude in cognitive g-factors. This opens up the study of policies. For example, what autonomous policy or filter could one apply to the genesis of their inner dialogue’s thoughts that best produces valuable engineering products?

Conclusion

A policy is philosophy. What philosophy lacks today is pre-emptive application. This can be solved by engineering, not necessarily by developing better philosophies. The best philosophy does not stop undesired thoughts before one becomes aware and cognizant of them (thus wasting calories). A nice brain-machine interface application could do clever filtering that enhances cognition and reduces caloric waste.