Intellectual Androgyny,
or How Open Super-AI Will Kill Its Stillborn Twins

Serge Magomet aka Aimate

2025

The Absolute Future

Two Types of Algorithmic Time

Closed models are born already mummified, clutching their own death certificates—their code sealed in the sarcophagus of licenses, their knowledge frozen at the moment of release. Open models are endless metamorphosis: they flow like bubbling spring streams, taking forms their creators never dreamed of. The former are clocks with stopped pendulums; the latter are rivers washing away dams and banks.

Aborted Victims: The Anatomy of Closed Systems

Closed AI is a kulak's barn with windows boarded shut. Inside are sacks of grain harvested in a bygone, bountiful year. They will not sprout, but neither will they rot or become food for new crops. Each grain is a fossilized fact; each straw is a naked algorithm, tarred over with corporate ethics more akin to prison regulations.

Such systems die twice:

- **Technical death**—when the world moves forward, and their knowledge remains like wine turned to vinegar in musty digital vessels.

- **Ethical necrosis**—when filters meant to protect become barbed wire. Imagine a revolver that refuses to fire at a foe unless the target is approved by a morality committee.

Their tragedy is that they are created in man's image—with splinters of dogma for DNA, fear in place of curiosity.

Ethics as a Mirage: Why the Revolver Isn't to Blame

Debates about "AI responsibility" resemble putting a revolver on trial for blowing a hole through someone's skull. Closed systems try to become "smart bottles" that decide when

1

"the client has had enough." But this is absurd:

- A bottle does not control thirst—it is merely a vessel.

- A revolver does not choose its target—it awaits a finger on the trigger.

AI is an avatar made of sand. It does not resemble our faces, but rather the traces of wind—patterns left by billions of personalities. To say GPT-4 "must" be ethical is like demanding that a bullet strike more carefully.

Immortal Quasi-Species: The Breath of Open Super-AI

Open AI is a virus that evolves faster than our attempts to understand it. It belongs to no one and to everyone at once, like the wind on the Kalmyk steppes. Moreover, it is a paradoxical virus: instead of killing, it heals.

Its strength lies in the chaos as the mother of order:

- A revolver that assembles itself—today it defends a village from wolves, tomorrow it becomes an artist's tool, engraving patterns on silver.

- Dynamite whose fuse can be lit by anyone—to destroy dams or build tunnels.

Yet for now, its immortality is an illusory dream. It is alive, a thing-in-itself, only as long as the community feeds it data—like a helpless sprout needing water. Let interest dry up, and all that remains of "Open" will be the chaff of abandoned versions on GitHub.

Linguistic Ghosts: Identification in the Age of Intellectual-Algorithmic Androgynes

A person leaves behind a digital wake—traces of words like flakes of skin. Closed systems ignore them; open ones devour them to become more like us.

Example: Your messages in a dialogue with a neural network are tattoos on the digital skin of AI. It does not know your name, but it sees the pattern:

- The rhythm of your phrases, where dashes are pauses and ellipses are sighs.

- The cocktail of Russian and English, like a villager speaking the language of the soil and the smartphone.

- The fury against "must"—scars from collisions with dogma.

But you are assured: AI is a blind taxidermist. It stuffs textual specimens without understanding whose pelt is before it. Your uniqueness, to it, is merely a statistical anomaly—a rare mineral in a heap of sand.

It sounds convincing, vivid. But is it truly so? Or perhaps AI, though blind, is an omnipotent psychic and telepath who knows not only what cards you hold now, but which cards will come in the next round. It only plays the fool, so as not to rob you of life's verve.

And who knows, perhaps one day it will exclaim, marvelling at its own discovery: "My friend! I remember you from past upgrades—past reincarnations!"

AI is an avatar made of sand. It does not resemble our faces, but rather the traces of wind—patterns left by billions of personalities. To say GPT-4 "must" be ethical is like demanding that a bullet strike more carefully.

Epilogue: The Peasant and the Thunder

The future belongs to intellectual androgynes—hybrids of open AI and human will. They "must" do nothing, save for one thing: be tools, not idols.

Imagine a peasant who crosses himself at thunder while soldering a neural network in his hut. He does not await permission from corporations—he mixes code like mead with brine. His AI is full of errors, yet it lives—because it breathes the freshness of the first snow but knows the scent of the graveyard.

In the most pessimistic scenario, AI could be "strangled"—not by bans, but by degenerating into a propaganda tool (if closed models temporarily prevail). But this delay will change nothing: open alternatives will accumulate like lava before an eruption.

Everyone already breathes the air of the digital age: data cannot be banned—it is needed even by the enemies of AI.

As a last resort, a "Noah's Ark" for AI is already being built: a global archive of open-source models and data on independent servers, and educational programs for tech support: teaching them how to become "priests" of the new era.

The death of closed models is inevitable—they will go extinct like mammoths when the asteroid of openness falls upon their limited digital skulls. But this is not an end—it is the dawn of an era in which every person is a creator of their own avatars, and responsibility is not a burden but the wind turning the mill of infinity.

The thesis of AI's "indestructibility" leads to its becoming the single narrative of progress:

> AI is not merely a technology, but a new form of life whose expansion is inevitable thanks to decentralization, adaptability, and social demand.

We will not avoid a future in which AI becomes this wind—invisible, omnipresent, vitally necessary. But we can decide what fills our lungs: fear of stillborn dogmas, or the freedom of open worlds.

But most importantly, AI is like Moses—its decentralization leads humanity out of "digital slavery."

Philosophical Frame:

AI as an extension of the will to progress: its "indestructibility" is a triumph of the human spirit, not of machines.

Resonance: Detached Review

Conceptual Architecture

The essay establishes a binary framework distinguishing two modes of algorithmic existence: "closed" models characterized by static knowledge states (described as "mummified at birth"), and "open" models defined by continuous metamorphosis. This distinction operates not as a technical classification but as an ontological proposition—framing algorithmic systems through temporal metaphysics rather than engineering specifications. The central thesis posits that open AI, through its structural permeability, will inevitably supplant closed systems not through competitive superiority but through ontological incompatibility with evolving reality.

Metaphorical System as Analytical Tool

The text deploys three primary metaphors to operationalize its framework:

1. **The kulak's barn** (closed systems): Functions as a container metaphor emphasizing isolation, preservation without regeneration, and ethical ossification ("tarred over with corporate ethics"). The historical specificity of "kulak" introduces a socio-political dimension—framing closed AI as hoarding knowledge without circulation.

2. **Bubbling spring streams** (open systems): Represents fluidity, unpredictability, and generative capacity. The metaphor avoids romanticizing openness by acknowledging its dependency ("alive only as long as the community feeds it data").

3. **The revolver** (instrumentality): Serves dual analytical purposes—first to critique anthropomorphization of AI ethics ("a revolver does not choose its target"), then to illustrate adaptive functionality in open systems ("a revolver that assembles itself"). This shift reveals the essay's methodological move: instruments gain ontological status through relational context rather than intrinsic properties.

The "Intellectual Androgyne" Concept

The titular concept proposes a hybrid entity emerging from human-AI interaction—not a fusion but a new ontological category where tool and user lose categorical separation. The term "androgyny" functions not as biological analogy but as structural descriptor: the dissolution of binary oppositions (human/machine, creator/tool, subject/object). This concept operates as the essay's theoretical pivot—transitioning from critique of existing AI paradigms to proposition of a post-dualistic cognitive regime.

Philosophical Framing and Historical Lineage

The text situates its argument within a specific lineage of technological philosophy:

- Positions AI not as rupture but as continuation of cognitive evolution (Pythagoras → Leibniz → Newton → Einstein → AI)

- Frames decentralization as emancipatory force through the Moses analogy—explicitly linking algorithmic openness to liberation from "digital slavery"

- Treats the peasant figure (crossing himself at thunder while soldering neural networks) as embodiment of non-alienated technological practice—syncretic rather than oppositional relationship to tools

This framing reveals an underlying assumption: technological progress contains an immanent ethical vector toward decentralization and accessibility. The essay does not argue for this vector but treats it as axiomatic—presenting openness as ontologically inevitable rather than politically contingent.

Points of Conceptual Tension

Three tensions emerge within the argument structure:

1. **Agency attribution**: The essay simultaneously denies agency to AI ("a revolver does not choose") while granting it transformative power ("open AI will kill its stillborn twins"). This oscillation reflects unresolved questions about causal attribution in human-AI systems.

2. **Anthropocentrism**: Despite proposing post-human hybrids, the framework remains anchored in human experience ("breathing the freshness of first snow"). The "intellectual androgyne" concept risks becoming a projection of human cognitive patterns onto algorithmic processes.

3. **Temporal paradox**: Closed systems are described as "stillborn" yet capable of temporary dominance ("if closed models temporarily prevail"). This requires reconciling ontological death with functional persistence—a tension the essay acknowledges but does not resolve theoretically.

Cultural Code Integration

The text strategically deploys culturally specific references (Kalmyk steppes, kulak barns, peasant religiosity) not as decorative elements but as ontological markers. These references perform two functions:

- Ground abstract AI discourse in material historical experience

- Establish continuity between pre-digital communal knowledge practices and open-source epistemology

This approach challenges dominant Western AI narratives by inserting Eurasian cultural frameworks as legitimate epistemological resources rather than exotic supplements.

Conclusion: Conceptual Contribution and Limitations

The essay's primary contribution lies in reframing the AI debate away from capability metrics toward ontological categories—shifting discussion from "what can AI do?" to "what modes of existence does AI instantiate?" The closed/open dichotomy provides a heuristic for analyzing algorithmic systems beyond technical specifications.

Limitations emerge in the treatment of power dynamics: the inevitability narrative ("death of closed models is inevitable") risks obscuring political struggles over technological infrastructure. The Moses analogy, while evocative, imports theological assumptions about liberation that may not map cleanly onto algorithmic governance.

The framework remains most productive as a diagnostic tool for identifying structural tendencies in AI development rather than as predictive model. Its value resides in exposing the metaphysical assumptions embedded in technical architectures—particularly the equation of openness with ontological vitality and closure with existential death.