Cory Parker

PHL-105-003

It’ll get worse before it gets better. A common enough phrase that provides some blind faith that things might work out in the end. The devil is in the details, unfortunately. I’m often telling friends and family of my optimism of the future, regarding technology and especially about Artificial General Intelligence. I’ve only just started reading papers, but my optimism, in truth, is because the alternative is just as Epictetus’ take on death. It’s not only completely pointless to worry about the inevitable, if it is in fact inevitable, but the best-case scenario is better than any of us can imagine now.

Most humans have a hard time intuiting exponentiation and it shows. The Lake Michigan analogy is great for the lay person to get some idea of the rate of change our technology exhibits. It looks far away… until it’s not. I’m grateful for covid just for the sake of AGI. *More* people now can intuit exponentiation more, than would otherwise be. I bring this up because of one of the most important questions he extends is, “What do we do over the next few decades.” Furthermore, with the onset of the stable diffusion technology, the advances in virtual reality and augmented reality, self-driving cars, and a ton more data-driven enterprises, with all that data, it really seems like that Ray Kurzweil may know what he’s talking about. I can see why some researchers would disagree, though.

The human brain is still so poorly understood, and we cannot even use the backdoor of physics to approach some reasonable explanation that would help with AGI (Artificial General Intelligence). Quantum Mechanics had married our models of gravity and the proton is still a mystery, but when it comes to the dying of Moore’s Law, I’m just not that concerned. I think we’ll overcome that it with ease if we haven’t already. Whether it’s cubic boron arsenide or nanotech, this is where humanity really does shine. Out of all the arguments opposing the concern of future AGI, this is the biggest one in my view. One possible other, is that the impressive feats of AI beating the GO champion, the protein folding, etc. All of those were based on Supervised Learning, which is not what will get to AGI, but Unsupervised learning. As with the Moore’s Law argument, the same hither. But whether it’s *conscious*, I could care less.

For the same reason I don’t understand why everyone assumes aliens would be anything remotely like us, blows my mind. Even more so, I don’t know why we assume they *must* be conscious entities. So far as I can tell, consciousness doesn’t seem to be cost efficient for our output in nature. Our *consciousness* emerged from bottom-up, our future AI will have bypassed all those limitation along the way. In the book Dune, in the beginning, where Paul is interacting with a Bene Gesserit, he says, “Thou shalt not make a machine in the likeness of a man’s mind. ” The Bene Gesserit lady responds with, “But what the O.C. Bible should’ve said is: ‘Thou shalt not make a machine to counterfeit a human mind.’”

So, I would be confident in arguing that, given all I’ve thought about, the unification of all people and the leveling out the disturbing wealth inequality seems like it should be the priority before it’s too late. When considering the labor force and what it will become, given the position we’re in now, it does seem obvious where our largest errors are as a country, but also as human beings. The irony is that this is most incentive humanity has ever had to become unified without the kumbaya stuff, and now, it’s approaching rapidly. I’ve complained as long as I can remember about the concept of money. It’s never made sense to me, and then I found out about the 2009 white paper introducing bitcoin, and all the possibilities that could come from that. I’m still reading up on the blockchain technology, but it sounds promising considering the clear economic dynamic shift, where people are becoming content creators, since data is the new oil.

It’ll get worse before it gets better. I’m writing this after the midterm election results of 2022, and I’m slightly more optimistic than I normally am. I’m not interested in politics and don’t usually ascribe the same level of importance to it as most people, but this was obviously different. I’ve been most optimistic because I think our definitions of what we think is *good* and what we think is *smart* is a little screwy. Smart people will oversee most things in the future I imagine, because the next generation “rulers” will have *some* understanding of some complex stuff. I tend to view intelligent people as, typically, good people, and usually proportionally so. A broad mental capacity can think of humanity in terms as a global species and have some inside to a wide variety of technical and complex concepts. At least I hope. I liked Drum’s breakdown that can be accessed by anyone.