

The Future of Agent-Based Simulation Metaphysics and Genesis according to Computer Science

Jonathan Thaler

jonathan.thaler@nottingham.ac.uk

School of Computer Science, University of Nottingham

Abstract

As Agent-Based Simulation (ABS) is still a young discipline we argue that it has still a bright future ahead. We claim that its logical future is to simulate our own world, thus creating a point where simulation and reality converge, an event we postulate and term Simulation-Convergence. Just by being able to talk about this convergence hints that there may be strong connections between the real world and ABS. As we will show the only really interesting and worthy reason for pursuing the Simulation-Convergence is to simulate free will. We argue that the emergent properties of such a simulation of the free will are ideologies - mechanisms for restricting free will. We hypothesize that the Simulation-Convergence may already have happened and that reality as we experience it is indeed an ABS created by our very self. This will give us a framework which allows us to talk about metaphysics from a computer-scientific view-point the first time. The remainder of the paper then interprets various metaphysical concepts like birth, death, karma, god, near-death experiences, afterlife, ethics, meditation, spiritual enlightenment, spiritual calling,... in this computer-scientific simulation-of-a-free-will context.

1. Introduction

2. Background

God From The Machine - Artificial Intelligence Models of Religious Cognition

Der Stoff, aus dem der Kosmos ist Das elegante Universum Die verborgene Wirklichkeit

Computability - Turing, Gödel, Church, and Beyond
God & Golem, Inc. - A Comment On Certain Points where Cybernetics Impinges on Religion
Mind Children - The Future Of Robot and Human Intelligence
Robot - Mere Machine To Transcendent Mind

2.1. Agent-Based Simulation

2.2. Constructivism vs. Platonism

3. Reality as ABS

TODO: in this section think about how reality could be implemented as an ABS

simulation of reality may be possible but that computation alone lacks an important ingredient: the spark of consciousness and free will which are inherently non-computable and thus non-constructive. Thus \Rightarrow we live in a constructed world But \Rightarrow we ourselves are non-constructive

4. Discussion

On the contrary to Nick Bostrom we come to completely different conclusions.

Why and what are we simulating? Free will

We have already created this future ABS, its our own world in which we live in. We needed to plant ourselves into it as the spark of consciousness and free will. Thus we created our own reality. We are our own gods. Caged into a sandbox not to inflict harm on the universe in exercising our free will.

5. Conclusions

] 1984: ultimately it is the aim of the party to remove free will. only in this unfree way, inner peace and bliss may become possible. this is in my opinion the brutal conclusion of the novel (he loves big brother in the end) [] i need to work out why this is exactly so: probably because free will is too powerful for a human to handle. it is too big. with free will fear comes. fear of being alone? this fear is silenced when submitting. why? giving up responsibility for ones own actions. fe [] now applied the deep insight of 1984 into our own world: free will will always lead to destruction. thus it

is the aim of all ideologies to remove free will to control the collective from eating each other [] thus ultimately the simulation/experiment of free will fails: it shows that immediately structures emerge which try to control the free will and to submit it into a collective [] this is also true for the right handed path: we give up our free will to a higher good (which is in no way different from any other ideology) [] actually the only way which embraces free will 100% is the so called left handed path. probably this is also the reason why it has been looked at in deep suspicion ever since humankind's dawn

References