# All-In Podcast #178 - In conversation with Sam Altman

Published - May 10, 2024

Transcribed by - thepodtranscripts.com

**Jason Calacanis**
I first met our next guest, Sam Altman, almost 20 years ago when he was working on a local mobile app called Loopt. We were both backed by Sequoia Capital. And in fact, we were both in the first class of Sequoia Scouts. He did investment in a little unknown fintech company called Stripe. I did Uber. And in that tiny experimental -

**Sam Altman**
You did Uber? I've never heard that before.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah. I think so. It's possible. It's starting already.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
You should write a book, JCal!

**Jason Calacanis**
Maybe.

[ Intro Music ]

**Jason Calacanis**
That tiny experimental fund that Sam and I were a part of at Scouts is Sequoia's highest-multiple-returning fund. A couple of low-digit millions turned into over $200 million I'm told. And then, he did -

**Sam Altman**
Really?

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah, that's what I was told by Roelof. Yeah. And he did a stint at Y Combinator where he was president from 2014 to 2019. In 2016, he co-founded OpenAI with the goal of ensuring that artificial general intelligence benefits all of humanity. In 2019, he left YC to join OpenAI full-time as CEO. Things got really interesting on November 30th of 2022. That's the day OpenAI launched ChatGPT. In January 2023, Microsoft invested $10 billion. In November 2023, over a crazy five-day span, Sam was fired from OpenAI. Everybody was going to go work at Microsoft. A bunch of heart emojis. Went viral on X / Twitter. And people started speculating that the team had reached artificial general intelligence. The world was going to end. And suddenly, a couple days later, he was back to being the CEO of OpenAI. In February, Sam was reportedly looking to raise $7 trillion for an AI chip project. This - after it was reported that Sam was looking to raise a billion from Masayoshi Son to create an iPhone killer with Jony Ive, the co-creator of the iPhone. All of this while ChatGPT has become better and better - and a household name. It's having a massive impact on how we

work and how work is getting done. And it's reportedly the fastest product to hit 100 million users in history - in just 2 months. And check out OpenAI's insane revenue ramp up. They reportedly hit $2 billion in ARR last year. Welcome to the All-In Podcast, Sam Altman.

**Sam Altman**
Thank you. Thank you guys.

**Jason Calacanis**
Sacks, you want to lead us off here?

**David Sacks**
Okay, sure. I mean - I - I think the whole industry is waiting with bated breath for the release of GPT-5. I guess it's been reported that it's launching some time this summer. But that's a pretty big window. Can you narrow that down? I guess - where - where are you in the release of GPT-5?

**Sam Altman**
We - we take our time on releases of major new models. And I don't think we - I think it will be great when we do it. And I think we'll be thoughtful about how we do it. Like we may release it in a different way than we've released previous models. Also, I don't even know if we will call it GPT-5. What I - what I will say is, a lot of people have noticed how much better GPT-4 has gotten since we've released it. And particularly, over the last few months. I think - I think that's like a better hint of what the world looks like - where it's not the like 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. But you - you just - you use an AI system and the whole system just gets better and better fairly continuously. I think that's like both a better technological direction. I think that's like easier for society to adapt to. But - but I assume that's where we'll head.

**David Friedberg**
Does that mean that there's not going to be long training cycles and it's continuously retraining or training submodels, Sam? And maybe you could just speak to us about what might change architecturally going forward with respect to large models?

**Sam Altman**
Well, I mean - one - one - one thing that you could imagine is this - just that you keep training -

**David Friedberg**
Right

**Sam Altman**
- a model. That - that would seem like a reasonable thing to me.

**David Friedberg**
Do you think that - yeah -

**Jason Calacanis**
And you talked about releasing it differently this time. Are you thinking maybe releasing it to the paid users first? Or, you know - a slower rollout to get the red teams tight? Since now, there's so much at stake. You have so many customers -

**Sam Altman**
Yeah.

**Jason Calacanis**
- actually paying and you've got everybody watching everything you do, you know? Is it - is it - you have to be more thoughtful now, yeah?

**Sam Altman**
Well, GPT-4 still only available to the paid users. But one of the things that we really want to do is figure out how to make more advanced technology available to free users too. I think that's a super important part of our mission. And - and this idea that we build AI tools and make them super widely available - free or - you know - not that expensive - whatever it is - so that people can use them to go - kind of - invent the future rather than the magic AI in the sky inventing the future and showering it down upon us. That seems like a much better path. It seems like more inspiring. I also think it's where things are actually heading. So, it makes me sad that we have not figured out how to make GPT-4-level technology available to free users. It's something we really want to do.

**Jason Calacanis**
It's just very expensive I - I take it?

**Sam Altman**
It's very expensive.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah. Chamath, your thoughts?

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
I think, maybe, the - the two big vectors, Sam, that people always talk about is that underlying cost and sort of the latency that's kind of rate-limited a killer app.

**Sam Altman**
Yeah.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
And then, I think the second is sort of the long-term ability for people to build in an open-source world versus a closed-source world. And I think the crazy thing about this space is that the open-source community is rabid. So, one example that I think is incredible is - you know - we had these guys do a pretty crazy demo for Devin. Remember, like - even like 5 or 6 weeks ago, that looked incredible. And then, some kid just published it under an open - MIT License - like OpenDevin. And it's incredibly good and almost as good as that other thing that was closed-source. So, maybe we can just start with that, which is: Tell me about the business decision to keep these models closed-source. And where do you see things going in the next couple years?

**Sam Altman**
So, on - on the first part of your question - speed and cost - those are hugely important to us. And I don't want to like give a timeline on when we can bring them down a lot because research is hard. But I am confident we'll be able to. We want to like cut the latency super dramatically. We want to cut the cost really, really dramatically. And I believe that will happen. We're still so early in the development of the science and understanding how this works. Plus we have all the engineering tailwinds. So, I - I don't know like when we get to intelligence too cheap to meter, and so fast that it feels instantaneous to us, and everything else. But I do believe we can get there for - you know - a pretty high level of - of intelligence. And I - it's important to us. It's clearly important to users. And it'll unlock a lot of stuff. On the sort of open-source/closed-source thing, I think there's great roles for both. I - I think - you know - we've open-sourced some stuff. We'll open-source more stuff in the future. But really, like our mission is to build towards AGI and to figure out how to broadly distribute its benefits. We have a strategy for that. It seems to be resonating with a lot of people. It obviously isn't for everyone. And there's like a big ecosystem. And there will also be open-source models and people who build that way. One area that I'm particularly interested, personally, an open-source for, is I want an open-source model that is as good as it can be that runs on my phone. And that, I think, is going to - you know - the world doesn't quite have the technology for a - for a good version of that yet. But that seems like a really important thing to go do at some point.

**Jason Calacanis**
Will you do - will you do that? Will you release one?

**Sam Altman**
I don't know if we will or someone will. But someone will.

**David Sacks**
But what about Llama 3?

**Sam Altman**
Llama 3 running on a phone?

**David Sacks**
Well, I guess maybe there's like a 7-billion-parameter version.

**Sam Altman**
Yeah. Yeah. I -

**David Sacks**
I don't know if that's - if that will fit on a phone or not, but -

**Sam Altman**
That should be fitable on a phone, but I don't - I don't - I'm not - I'm not sure if that one is like - I haven't played with it. I don't know if it's like -

**David Sacks**
Yeah.

**Sam Altman**
- good enough to kind of do the thing I'm thinking about here.

**David Sacks**
So, when - when Llama 3 got released, I think the big takeaway for a lot of people was, "Oh, wow. They've like caught up to GPT-4." I don't think it's equal in all dimensions, but it's like pretty - pretty close or pretty in the ballpark. I guess the question is - you know - you guys released 4 a while ago. You're working on 5 or - you know - more upgrades to 4. I mean - I think, to Chamath's point about Devin, how do you stay ahead of open-source? I mean - it's just - that's just like a very hard thing to do, in general, right? I mean - how do you think about that?

**Sam Altman**
What we're trying to do is not make the sort of smartest set of weights that we can. What we're trying to make is like this useful intelligence layer for people to use. And a model is part of that. I think we will stay pretty far ahead of - I hope - stay pretty far ahead of the rest of the world on that. But there's a lot of other work around the whole system that's not just that - you know - the - the model weights. And we'll have to build up enduring value the old-fashioned way like any other business does. We'll have to figure out a great product, and reasons to stick with it, and - you know - deliver it at a great price.

**Jason Calacanis**
When you founded the organization, you - the stated goal or part of what you discussed was, "Hey, this is too important for any one company to own it. So therefore, it needs to be open." Then, there was the switch, "Hey, it's too dangerous for anybody to be able to see it. And we need to lock this down." - because you had some fear about that, I think. Is - is that accurate? Because the cynical side is like, "Well, this is a capitalistic move." And then, the - I think - you know - I'm - I'm curious what the decision was here in terms of going from open - "We - the world needs to see this. It's really important." - to closed - "Only we can see it."

**Sam Altman**
Well, I mean -

**Jason Calacanis**
How did you come to that - that - that conclusion? What were the discussions like? Yeah.

**Sam Altman**
Part of the reason that we released ChatGPT was we want the world to see this. And we've been trying to tell people that AI is really important. And if you go back to like October of 2022, not that many people thought AI was going to be that important or that it was really happening.

**Jason Calacanis**
No.

**Sam Altman**
And a huge part of what we try to do is put the technology in the hands of people. Now again, there's different ways to do that. And I think there really is an important role to just say like, "Here's the weights. Have at it." But the fact that we have so many people using a free version of ChatGPT that we don't - you know - we don't run ads on. We don't try to like make money on. We just put out there because we want people to have these tools. I think has done a lot to provide a lot of value and - you know - teach people how to fish. But also, to get the world really thoughtful about what's happening here. Now, we still don't have all the answers. And we're fumbling our way through this like everybody else. And I assume we'll change strategy many more times as we learn new things. You know - when we started OpenAI, we had really no idea about how things were going to go - that we'd make a language model - that we'd ever make a product. We - we started off just - I remember very clearly that first day we were like, "Well, now we're all here. That was - you know - it was difficult to get the set up, but what happens now? Maybe we should write some papers. Maybe we should stand around a whiteboard." And we've just been trying to like put one foot in front of the other and figure out what's next, and what's next, and what's next. And I think we'll keep doing that.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Can I just replay something and just make sure I heard it right? I think what you were saying on the open-source/closed-source thing is - if I heard it right - all these models, independent of the business decision you make, are going to become asymptotically accurate towards some amount of accuracy. Like not all - but like let's just say there's four or five that are well capitalized enough - you guys, Meta, Google, Microsoft, whomever, right? So, the - let's just say four or five - maybe one startup. And on the open web. And then quickly, the accuracy or the value of these models will probably shift to these proprietary sources of training data that you could get that others can't or others can get that you can't. Is that how you see this thing evolving where the open web gets everybody to a certain threshold and then it's just an arms race for data beyond that?

**Sam Altman**
I doesn't feel - so, I - I definitely don't think it'll be an arms race for data because when the models get smart enough, at some point, it shouldn't be about more data - at least, not for training. It may matter - data - to make it useful. Look, the - the one thing that I have learned most throughout all of this is that it's hard to make confidence statements a couple of years in the future about where this is all going to go. And so, I don't want to try now. I - I will say that I - I expect lots of very capable models in the world. And - you know - like it feels to me like we just stumbled on a new fact of nature, or science, or whatever you want to call it - which is like we can create - you can like - I - I mean - I don't believe this literally, but it's like a spiritual point. You know, intelligence is just this emergent property of matter. And that's like a - that's like rule of physics or something. So, people are going to figure that out. But there will be all these different ways to design the systems. People will make different choices. Figure out new ideas. And I'm sure like - you know - like any other industry, I would expect there to be multiple approaches. And different people like different ones. You know, some people like iPhones. Some people like an Android phone. I - I think there will be some effect like that.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Let's go back to that first section of just the - the cost and the speed. All of you guys are sort of a little bit rate limited on, literally, Nvidia's throughput, right? And I think that you and most everybody else have sort of effectively announced how much capacity you can get just because it's as much as they can spin out. What needs to happen at the substrate so that you can actually compute cheaper, compute faster, get access to more energy? How are you helping to frame out the industry solving those problems?

**Sam Altman**
We'll - we'll make huge algorithmic gains for sure. And I don't want to discount that. I'll - you know - I'm very interested in chips and energy, but if we can make our - if we can make a same-quality model twice as efficient, that's like we had twice as much compute.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Right.

**Sam Altman**
And I think there's a gigantic amount of work to be done there. And I hope we'll start really seeing those results. Other than that, the whole supply chain is like very complicated, you know? There's - there's logic fab capacity. There's how much HBM the world can make. There's how quickly you can like get permits, and pour the concrete, and make the data centers, and then have people in there wiring them all up. There's finding the energy, which is a huge bottleneck. But I think when there's this much value to people, the world will do its thing. We'll try to help it happen faster. And there's probably like - I don't know how to give it a number - but there's like some percentage chance where there is, as you were saying, like a huge substrate breakthrough. And we have like a massively more efficient way to do computing. But I don't - I don't like bank on that or spend too much time thinking about it.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
What about the device side and sort of - you mentioned sort of the models that can fit on a phone. So obviously, whether that's an LLM, or some SLM, or something - I'm sure you're thinking about that. But then, does the device itself change? I mean - is it - does it need to be as expensive as an iPhone?

**Sam Altman**
I'm super interested in this. I - I love like great new form factors of computing. And it feels like with every major technological advance, a new thing becomes possible. Phones are unbelievably good. So, I think the threshold is like very high here.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Mmhmm.

**Sam Altman**
Like what - like I think - I think like - I personally think the iPhone is like the greatest piece of technology humanity has ever made. It's really a wonderful product and -

**Jason Calacanis**
What come after it? Like -

**Sam Altman**
I don't know. I mean - I was going to - that was what I was saying. It's so good. To get beyond it, I think the bar is like quite high.

**Jason Calacanis**
Well, you've been - you've been working with Jony Ives on - on something, right? Where -

**Sam Altman**
We've been discussing ideas, but I don't -

**Jason Calacanis**
Where -

**Sam Altman**
- like - if I knew -

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Is it that - that it has to be more complicated or actually just much, much cheaper and simpler?

**Sam Altman**
Well, everyone - almost everyone is willing to pay for a phone anyway. So, if you could like make a way cheaper device, I think the barrier to carry a second thing or use a second thing is pretty high. So, I don't think cost - given that we're all willing to pay for phones - or most of us are - I don't think cheaper is the answer.

**Jason Calacanis**
Different is the answer then?

**David Sacks**
Would there be like a specialized chip that would run on the phone that was really good at powering a - you know - a phone-size AI model?

**Sam Altman**
Probably, but the phone manufacturers are going to do that for sure. That doesn't - that doesn't necessitate a new device. I think you'd have to find some really different interaction paradigm that the technology enables. And if I knew what it was, I would be excited to be working on it right now. But it's -

**Jason Calacanis**
Well, you have - you have voice working right now in the app. In fact, I set my action button on my phone to go directly to ChatGPT's voice app. And I use it with my kids and they love it - talking to it -

**Sam Altman**
I think -

**Jason Calacanis**
It's got latency issues, but it's really -

**Sam Altman**
We'll - we'll get - we'll - we'll get that - we'll get that better. And I think voice -

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**Sam Altman**
- is a hint to whatever the next thing is. Like if you can get voice interaction to be really good, it feels - I think that feels like a different way to use a computer. But again, like -

**Jason Calacanis**
What's the blocker with that by the way? Like, what - why is it not responsive? And you know, it's - it feels like a CB. You know like, "Over. Over."

**Sam Altman**
Yeah. Yeah. Yeah, totally.

**Jason Calacanis**
It's really annoying to use - you know - in that way. But it - it's also brilliant when it gives you the right answer.

**Sam Altman**
We are working on that. I - it's - it's so clunky right now. It's slow. It's like kind of - doesn't feel very smooth, or authentic, or organic. Like we'll get all that to be much better.

**David Sacks**
What about computer vision? I mean - they have glasses or maybe you can wear a pendant.

**Sam Altman**
Yeah.

**David Sacks**
I mean - you take the combination of visual or video data combined with voice. And now -

**Sam Altman**
Super -

**David Sacks**
- the AI knows everything that's happening around you.

**Sam Altman**
Super powerful to be able to like - the multimodality of saying like, "Hey, ChatGPT. What am I looking at?" Or like, "What kind of plant is this? I can't quite tell." That's obvious - that - that's like - that's another, I think, like hint. But whether people want to wear glasses or like hold up something when they want that - like I - I - I - there's a bunch of just like the - like the - the sort of like - societal/interpersonal issues here are all very complicated -

**Jason Calacanis**
Oh, yes.

**Sam Altman**
- about wearing a computer on your face.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah. We - we saw that with Google Glass. People got punched in the face in the Mission. It started a lot of fights. Yeah.

**Sam Altman**
I forgot about that. Forgot about that. So - so, I - I think it's like -

**David Sacks**
What are the apps that could be unlocked if AI was sort of ubiquitous on people's phones? Do you have a sense of that? Or what would you want to see built?

**Sam Altman**
I - I think what I want is just this always-on like super-low-friction thing where I can - either by voice, or by text, or ideally like some other - it just kind of knows what I want. Have this like constant thing helping me throughout my day that's got like as much context on - as possible. It's like the world's greatest assistant and it's just this like thing working to make me better and better. There's - there - there's like a - you know when you hear people like talk about the AI future they're imagining - they imagine - there's sort of two different approaches. And they don't sound that different, but I think they're like very different for how we'll design the system in practice. There's the, "I want an extension of myself." I want like a ghost, or an alter ego, or this thing that really like is me - is acting on my behalf - is responding to emails - not even telling me about it. It is - is sort of like - it - it becomes more me and is me. And then, there's this other thing which is like, "I want a great senior employee." It may get to know me very well. I may delegate it. You know, you can like have access to my email and I'll tell you the constraints. But - but I think of it as this like separate entity. And I, personally, like the separate-entity approach better and think that's where we're going to head. And so, in that sense, the thing is not you. But it's - it's like a - always available, always great, super-capable assistant/executive - whatever.

**Jason Calacanis**
It's an agent in a way. Like it's out there working on your behalf, and understands what you want, and anticipates what you want - is - is - is what I'm reading into what you're saying.

**Sam Altman**
I think there'll be agent-like behavior. But there's like a difference between a senior employee and an agent.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Yeah.

**Sam Altman**
And - and like I want it - you know - I think of like my - I think like a - like one of the things that I like about a - a senior employee is they'll - they'll push back on me. They will sometimes not do something I ask. Or they'll sometimes say like, "I can do that thing if you want. But if I do it, here's what I think would happen. And then, this. And then, that. And are you really sure?"

**Jason Calacanis**
Hmm.

**Sam Altman**
I definitely want that kind of vibe, which - not - not just like this thing that I -

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Reasoning.

**Sam Altman**
- give a task and it blindly does -

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Yeah. It can reason.

**Sam Altman**
For sure.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah and push back.

**Sam Altman**
It can be reason and it has like the kind of relationship with me that I would expect out of a really competent person that I worked with, which is different from like a sycophant.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
The thing in that world where if you have this like J.A.R.V.I.S.-like thing that can reason, what do you think it does to products that you use today where the interface is very valuable? So for example, if you look at an Instacart, or if you look at an Uber, or if you look at a DoorDash. These are not services that are meant to be pipes that are just providing a set of APIs to a smart set of agents that ubiquitously work on behalf of 8 billion people. What do you think has to change in how we think about how apps need to work - of how this entire infrastructure of experiences need to work in a world where you're agentically interfacing to the world, you know?

**Sam Altman**
I'm actually very interested in designing a world that is equally usable by humans and by AIs. So, I - I - I - I - I - I like the interoperability of that. I like the smoothness of the handoffs. I like the ability that we can provide feedback or whatever. So, you know - DoorDash could just expose some API to my future AI assistant, and they could go put the order in, and whatever. Or I could say like - I could be holding my phone and I could say, "Okay, AI assistant." - like - "You. Put in this order on DoorDash, please." And I could like watch the app open, and see the thing clicking around, and I could say, "Hey, no. Not this." - or like. There's - there's something about designing a world that is usable equally well by humans and AIs that I think is an interesting concept.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
And can manage the handoffs.

**Sam Altman**
Same reason I'm like more excited about humanoid robots than sort of robots of like varying other shapes. The world is very much designed for humans and I think we should absolutely keep it that way.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Mmhmm.

**Sam Altman**
And a shared interface is nice.

**Jason Calacanis**
So, you see voice/chat - that modality - kind of gets rid of apps. You just ask it for sushi. It knows sushi you liked before. It knows what you don't like. And does its best shot at doing it.

**Sam Altman**
I - I - it's hard for me to imagine that we just go to a world totally where you say like, "Hey, ChatGPT. Order me sushi." And it says, "Okay, do you want it from this restaurant? What kind and what time?" - whatever. I think user - I think visual user interfaces are super good for a lot of things. And it's hard for me to imagine like a world where you never look at a screen and just use voice mode only, but I - I can imagine that for a lot of things.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah, I mean - Apple tried with Siri like you could - supposedly that you could order at Uber automatically with Siri. I don't think anybody's ever done it because it's - you know - why would you take the risk of not -

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Well, the quality - to your point - the quality is not good. But when the quality is good enough, you'll - you'll actually prefer it just because it's just lighter weight. You don't have to take your phone out. You don't have to search for your app and press it. And, oh. It automatically logged you out. Oh, hold on. Log back in. Oh, 2FA. It's a whole pain in the ass.

**Sam Altman**
You know, it's like setting a timer with Siri. I do every time because it works really well and it's great.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Works really well. Exactly.

**Sam Altman**
And I don't need more information. But ordering in Uber - like I want to see the prices for a few different options. I want to see how far away it is. I want to see like - maybe even where they are on the map because I might walk somewhere. I get a lot more information by - I think in less time - by looking at that order on the Uber screen than I would if I had to do that all through the audio channel. So -

**Jason Calacanis**
I like your idea of watching it happen. That's kind of cool.

**Sam Altman**
I think there will just be like - yeah - different - there are different interfaces we use for different tasks. And I think that'll keep going.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Of all the developers that are building apps and experiences on OpenAI, are there a few that stand out for you? Where you're like, "Okay, this is, directionally, going in the super

interesting area." Even if it's like a toy app. But are there things that you guys point to and say, "This is really important."

**Sam Altman**
I met with a new company this morning - or barely even a company. It's like two people that are going to work on a summer project trying to actually finally make the AI tutor like -

**Jason Calacanis**
Hmm.

**Sam Altman**
And - and I've always been interested in the space. I - a lot of people have done great stuff on our platform, but if - if someone can deliver like THE way that you actually like - they used a phrase I loved, which is, "This is going to be like a Montessori-level reinvention for how people - how people learn things."

**Jason Calacanis**
Wow. Yeah.

**Sam Altman**
But if you can like find this new way to like let people explore and learn in new ways on their own - I'm, personally, super excited about that. A lot of the coding-related stuff - you mentioned Devin earlier - I think that's like a super cool vision of the future. The thing that I am - health - healthcare, I believe, should be pretty transformed by this. But the thing I'm personally most excited about is the sort of doing faster and better scientific discovery. GPT-4 clearly not there in a big way - although, maybe it accelerates things a little bit by making scientists more productive.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
But AlphaFold 3. Yeah.

**Sam Altman**
But that's like -

**David Friedberg**
But Sam -

**Sam Altman**
That will be a triumph.

**David Friedberg**
Those are not - like these - these models are trained and built differently than the language models. I mean - to some - the - obviously, there's a lot that's similar. But there's a lot - there's kind of a ground-up architecture to a lot of these models that are being applied to these specific problem sets - these - these - these specific applications like chemistry interaction modeling, for example. Does -

**Sam Altman**
You'll - you'll need some of that, for sure. But the - the thing that I think we're missing - across the board - for many of these things we've been talking about is models that can do reasoning. And once you have reasoning, you can connect it to chemistry stimulators or whatever else.

**David Friedberg**
So, I - I guess - yeah, that's the important question I - I wanted to kind of talk about today - was this idea of networks of models. People talk a lot about agents as if there's kind of this linear set of call functions that happen.

**Sam Altman**
Yeah.

**David Friedberg**
But one of the things that arises in biology is networks of systems that have cross interactions - that the aggregation of the system produces - the aggregation of the network produces an output - rather than one thing calling another and that that thing calling another. Do we see like an emergence in this architecture of either specialized models or network models that work together to address bigger problem sets - use reasoning? There's computational models that do things like chemistry or arithmetic and there's other models that do - rather than one model to rule them all that's purely generalized?

**Sam Altman**
I don't know. I don't know how much reasoning is going to turn out to be a supergeneralizable thing. I suspect it will, but that's more just like an intuition and a hope. And it would be nice if it worked out that way. I - I don't know if that's like -

**David Friedberg**
But let's walk through the - the protein modeling example. There's a bunch of training data - images of proteins - and then sequence data and they build a model - predictive model. And they have a set of processes and steps for doing that. Do you envision that there's this artificial general intelligence or this great reasoning model that then figures out how to build that submodel - that figures out how to solve that problem by acquiring the necessary data and then resolving into a solution.

**Sam Altman**
There's so many ways where that could go. Like maybe it is - it trains a literal model for it or maybe it just knows the one big model what - it can like go pick what other training data it needs and ask a question and then update on that.

**David Friedberg**
Right. I guess the real question is are all these startups going to die because so many startups are working in that modality, which is: Go get special data, and then train a new model on that special data from the ground up, and then it only does that one sort of thing. And it works really well at that one thing. And it works better than anything else at that one thing.

**Sam Altman**
You know, there's - there's like a version of this, I think, you can like already see. Because when you were - when you were talking about like biology and these complicated networks of systems, the reason I was smiling - I - I got super sick recently. And I'm mostly better now. But it was just like body like got beat up like one system at a time - felt like - you can really tell like, "Okay, it's this cascading thing." And that reminded me of you like talking about the - like biology is just these like - you have no idea how much these systems interact with each other until things start going wrong. And that was sort of like interesting to see. But I was using - I was like using ChatGPT to try to like figure out like what was happening - whatever. And - and it would say, "Well, I'm - you know - unsure of this one thing." And then, I just like posted a paper on it without even reading the paper - like in the context. And it says, "Oh, that was the thing I was unsure of. Like now, I think this instead." So, there's like a - that was like small version of what you're talking about where you can like - can say, "This - I don't - I don't know this thing.", and you can put more information. You don't retrain any of the models. You're just adding into the context here. And now, you're getting them -

**David Friedberg**
But so - so, these models that are predicting protein structure, like let's say, right? This is the whole basis. And now - now, other molecules at AlphaFold 3. Can they - can - yeah, I mean - is it, basically, a world where the best generalized model goes in, and gets that training data, and then figures out on its own? And maybe you could - maybe you could use an example for us. Can you tell us about Sora, your video model, that generates amazing moving images - moving video? And - and what's different about the architecture there? Whatever you're willing to share on how it may - on how that is different?

**Sam Altman**
Yeah. So, my - on the general thing first - my - you clearly will need specialized simulators, connectors, pieces of data, whatever. But my intuition - and again, I don't have this like backed up with science - my intuition would be if we can figure out the core of generalized

reasoning, connecting that to new problem domains - in the same way that humans are generalized reasoners - would, I think, be - be doable.

**David Friedberg**
It's like a fast unlock - faster unlock than -

**Sam Altman**
I think - I - I think so.

**David Friedberg**
Mmmhmm. Mmmhmm.

**Sam Altman**
But yeah. You - you - Sora like does not start with a language model. It's - it - that - that's a model that is like customized to do video. And - and so like we're clearly not at that world yet.

**David Friedberg**
Right. So, you guys - so, just as an example - for you guys to build a good video model, you built it from scratch using, I'm assuming, some different architecture and different data. But in the future, the generalized reasoning system - the AGI -

**Sam Altman**
Yeah.

**David Friedberg**
- whatever system - theoretically, could render that by figuring out how to do it.

**Sam Altman**
Yeah, I mean - one example of this is like - okay - you know - as far as I know, all the best text models in the world are still autoregressive models. And the best image and video models are diffusion models -

**David Friedberg**
Right. That's it.

**Sam Altman**
- and that's like sort of strange in some sense.

**David Friedberg**
Yeah. Yeah.

**Jason Calacanis**
So, there's a big debate about training data. You guys have been, I think, the most thoughtful of any company. You've got licensing deals now - FT, etc. And we got to just be gentle here because you're involved in a New York Times lawsuit. You weren't able to settle, I guess, an arrangement with them for training data. How do you think about fairness and fair use? We've had big debates here on the pod. Obviously, your actions are - you know - speak volumes - that you're trying to be fair by doing licensing deals. So, what - what's your personal position on the rights of artists who create beautiful music, lyrics, books. And - and you taking that, and then making a derivative product out of it, and - and then monetizing it. And - and what's fair here? And - and how do we get to a world where - you know - artists can make content in the world and then decide what they want other people to do with it?

**Sam Altman**
Yeah.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah. And - and - and I'm just curious about your personal belief because I know you to be a thoughtful person on this. And I know a lot of other people in our industry are not very thoughtful about how they think about content creators.

**Sam Altman**
So, I think it's very different for different kinds of - I mean - look. On - on fair use, I think we have a - a very reasonable position under the current law. But I think AI is so different that for things like art, we'll need to think about them in different ways. But let's say - if you go read a bunch of math on the internet and learn how to do math - that, I think, seems unobjectionable to most people. And then, there's like - you know - another set of people who might have a different opinion. Well, what if you like - actually, let me not get into that - just in the interest of not making this answer too long. So, I - I think there's like - one category of people are like, "Okay, there's like generalized human knowledge." You can kind of like go - if you learn that, like that's - that - that's like "open domain" or something if you kind of go learn about the Pythagorean Theorem. That's one end of the spectrum. And then, I think the other extreme end of the spectrum is - is art. And maybe even like more than - more specifically, I would say - it's like doing - it's a system generating art in the style or the likeness of another artist would be kind of the furthest end of that. And then, there's many, many cases on the spectrum in between. I think the conversation has been historically very caught up on training data, but it will increasingly become more about what happens at inference time -

**Jason Calacanis**
Ah.

**Sam Altman**
- as training data becomes less valuable. And the - what the system does - accessing - you know - information in - in context in real time or - you know - taking like - like something like that. What happens at inference time will become more debated and - and how the - what the new economic model is there. So, if you say like - if you say like, "Create me a song in the - in the style of Taylor Swift." Even if the model were never trained on any Taylor Swift songs at all, you can still have a problem - which is that it may have read about Taylor Swift. It may know about her themes. Taylor Swift means something. And then - and then, the question is like: Should that model, even if we were never trained on any Taylor Swift song whatsoever, be allowed to do that? And if so, how should Taylor get paid?

**Jason Calacanis**
Right.

**Sam Altman**
So, I think there's an opt-in/opt-out in that case, first of all. And then, there's an economic model. Staying on the music example, there is something interesting to look at from the historical perspective here - which is sampling and how the economics around that work.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yes.

**Sam Altman**
This is not quite the same thing, but it's like an interesting place to start looking at.

**David Friedberg**
Sam, let me just challenge that. What's the difference in the example you're giving of the model learning about things like song structure, tempo, melody, harmony relationships - all the - discovering all the underlying structure that makes music successful and then building new music using training data and what a human does that listens to lots of music, takes - learns about - and figures - and their brain is processing and building all those same sort of predictive models, or those same sort of discoveries, or understandings?

**Sam Altman**
Yeah.

**David Friedberg**
What's the difference here? And why are you making the case that perhaps artists should be uniquely paid? This is not a sampling situation. You're not - the AI is not outputting and it's not storing in the model the actual original song.

**Sam Altman**
Yeah, I wasn't -

**David Friedberg**
It's learning structure, right? So -

**Sam Altman**
I wasn't trying to make that - that point.

**David Friedberg**
Yeah, okay.

**Sam Altman**
Because I agree. Like in the same way that humans are inspired by other humans.

**David Friedberg**
Right.

**Sam Altman**
I was saying if you - if you say, "Generate me a song in the style of Taylor Swift."

**David Friedberg**
I see. Right, okay.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**David Friedberg**
Where the prompt -

**Sam Altman**
Yeah, I think that's like a -

**David Friedberg**
- where the prompt leverages some artist. But -

**Sam Altman**
I - I think, personally, that's a different case.

**David Friedberg**
Would you be comfortable asking - or would you be comfortable letting the model train itself - or a music model being trained on the whole corpus of music that humans have

created without royalties being paid to the artists. That - that music is being fed in and then you're not allowed to ask - you know - artist-specific prompts. You could just say, "Hey, play me a - play me a - a really cool pop song that's fairly modern about heartbreak..." - and you know - "...with a female voice."

**Sam Altman**
Yeah.

**David Friedberg**
You know?

**Sam Altman**
We have - we have currently made the decision not to do music and, partly, because exactly these questions of where you draw the lines.

**David Friedberg**
Mmhmm. Mmhmm.

**Sam Altman**
And you know - what - like - even - I was meeting with several musicians that I really admire recently. I was just trying to like talk about some of these edge cases. But even the world in which - if we went and let's say we paid 10,000 musicians to create a bunch of music just to make a great training set where the music model could learn everything about song - song structure, and what makes a good catchy beat, and everything else. And only trained on that. Let's say we could still make a great music model, which maybe - maybe we could. You know - I was kind of like posing that as a thought experiment to musicians. And they're like, "Well, I can't object to that on any principal basis at that point. And yet, there's still something I don't like about it." Now, that's not a reason not to do it, necessarily. But it is - did you see that ad that Apple put out? Maybe it was yesterday or something - of like squishing all of human creativity down into one really thin iPad?

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah. Yeah. What was your take on it? People got really emotional about it. Yeah.

**Sam Altman**
Yeah. Yeah, yeah, yeah.

**Jason Calacanis**
It's a stronger reaction than you would think. Yeah.

**Sam Altman**
There's something about - I'm obviously hugely positive on AI. But there is something that I think is beautiful about human creativity and human artistic expression. And you know - for an AI that just does better science - like, "Great. Bring that on." But an AI that is going to do this like deeply beautiful human creative expression. I think we should like figure out - it's going to happen. It's going to be a tool that will lead us to greater creative heights. But I think we should figure out how to do it in a way that like preserves the spirit of what we all care about here.

**Jason Calacanis**
And - and I think your actions speak loudly. We were trying to do Star Wars characters in DALL-E. And if you ask for Darth Vader, it says, "Hey, we can't do that." So, you've - I guess red teamed or whatever you - you call it internally.

**Sam Altman**
We try.

**Jason Calacanis**
You're - yeah, you're not allowing people to use other people's IP. So, you've taken that decision. Now, if you asked it to make a Jedi bulldog or a Sith Lord bulldog - which I did - it made my bulldogs as Sith bulldogs, so you -

**Sam Altman**
There's an interesting question about like where -

**Jason Calacanis**
It's really about your spectrum, right? Yeah.

**Sam Altman**
Yeah. You know, we put out this thing yesterday called The Spec where we're trying to say, "Here are - here's - here's how our model is supposed to behave." And it's very hard. It's a long document. It's very hard to like specify exactly, in each case, where the limits should be. And I view this as like a discussion that's going to need a lot more input. But - but these sorts of questions about, "Okay, maybe it shouldn't generate Darth Vader. But the idea of a Sith Lord, or a Sith-style thing, or Jedi - at this point - is like part of the culture." Or like - like - these are - these are all hard decisions.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah. And - and I think you're right. The music industry is going to consider this opportunity to make Taylor Swift songs their opportunity. It's part of the four-part fair use test - is - you know - these - who gets to capitalize on new innovations for existing art? And - and Disney has an argument that, "Hey..." - you know - "...if - if you're going to make Sora versions of

Ahsoka..." - or whatever - "...Obi-Wan Kenobi". That's Disney's opportunity. And that's a great partnership for you - you know - to pursue.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
So, we're - I think this section I would label as "AI and the Law." So, let me ask -

**Jason Calacanis**
Yes.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
- maybe a higher-level question. What does it mean when people say "regulate AI"?

**David Friedberg**
Totally.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Sam, what does it - what does that even mean?

**David Friedberg**
And comment on California's new proposed regulations as - as well as you feel up for it.

**Sam Altman**
I'm concerned. I mean - there's so many proposed regulations.

**David Friedberg**
Yeah.

**Sam Altman**
But most of the ones I've seen on - the California state things I'm concerned about. I also have a general fear of the states all doing this them - themselves. When people say "regulate AI", I don't think they mean one thing. I think there's like - some people are like, "Ban the whole thing." Some people like, "Don't allow it to be open-source...Require it to be open-source." The thing that I am, personally, most interested in is I think there will come - look, I may be wrong about this. I will acknowledge that this is a forward-looking statement and those are always dangerous to make. But I think there will come a time in the not-super-distant future - like you know - we're not talking like decades and decades from now - where AI systems - the frontier AI systems - are capable of causing significant global harm. And for those kinds of systems - in the same way we have like global oversight of nuclear weapons, or synthetic bio, or things that can really like have a very negative impact way beyond the realm of one country - I - I would like to see some sort of international agency that is looking at the most powerful systems and ensuring like reasonable safety

testing. You know - these things are not going to escape and recursively self-improve or whatever.

**Jason Calacanis**
The criticism of this is that you are - you have the resources to cozy up - to lobby - to be involved in - you've been very involved with politicians. And then startups - which you are also passionate about and invest in - are not going to have the ability to resource, and deal with this, and that this regulatory capture - as per our friend - you know - Bill Gurley did a great talk last year about it. So, maybe you could address that head on? Do you - do you feel like -

**Sam Altman**
You know - if the - if the line were we're only going to look at models that are trained on computers that cost more than $10 billion, or more than $100 billion, or whatever dollars - I'd be fine with that. There'd be some line that'd be fine. And I don't think -

**Jason Calacanis**
Ah.

**Sam Altman**
- that puts any regulatory burden on startups.

**Jason Calacanis**
So, if you have like the - the nuclear raw material to make a nuclear bomb - like there's a small subset of people who have that - therefore, you use the analogy of like a - a nuclear inspectors kind of situation.

**Sam Altman**
Yeah. Yeah.

**Jason Calacanis**
I think that that's interesting. Sacks, you have a question?

**David Sacks**
Well, Chamath, go ahead. You had a follow-up.

**Sam Altman**
Can I say one more thing about that?

**Jason Calacanis**
Of course.

**Sam Altman**
I - I'd be super nervous about regulatory overreach here. I think we can get this wrong by doing way too much or even a little too much. I think we can get this wrong by doing not enough. But - but I do think part of - and I - and now, I mean - you know - we have seen regulatory overstepping or capture just get super bad in other areas. And you know - like also maybe nothing will happen. But - but I think it is part of our duty and our mission to like talk about what we believe is likely to happen and what it takes to get that right.

**David Friedberg**
The challenge, Sam, is that we have statute that is meant to protect people - protect society at large. What we're creating, however, is statute that gives the government rights to go in and audit code - to audit business trade secrets. We've never seen that to this degree before. Basically, the California legislation that's proposed and some of the federal legislation that's been proposed basically requires the federal - the government to audit a model - to audit software - to audit and review the parameters and the weightings of the model. And then, you need their checkmark in order to deploy it for commercial or public use. And for me, it just feels like we're trying to rein in the - the - the - the government agencies for fear and - and because folks have a hard time understanding this and are scared about the implications of it, they want to control it.

**Sam Altman**
Yeah. Yeah.

**David Friedberg**
And because they want - and - and the only way to control it is to say, "Give me a right to audit before you can release it", as opposed to say -

**David Sacks**
Yeah. And they're clueless. These people are clueless.

**David Friedberg**
And they're clueless. I mean - the way that the - this stuff is written - you read it. You're like going to pull your hair out because, as you know - better than anyone - in 12 months, none of this stuff's gonna make sense anyway.

**Sam Altman**
Totally.

**David Friedberg**
Right?

**Sam Altman**
Look, the reason I have pushed for an agency-based approach for the - for - for kind of like the big picture stuff and not a like write it in laws. I don't - in 12 months, it will all be written wrong. And I don't think - even if these people were like true world experts - I don't think they could get it right looking out on 12 or 24 months. And I don't - these policies - which is like, "We're gonna look at..." - you know - "...we're gonna audit all of your source code and like look at all of your weights one by one." Like, yeah. I think there's a lot of crazy proposals out there.

**David Friedberg**
By the way, especially if the models are always being retrained all the time - if they become more dynamic.

**Sam Altman**
Again, this is why I think it's - yeah.

**David Friedberg**
Right. Yeah. Yeah.

**Sam Altman**
But - but like when - before an airplane gets certified, there's like a set of safety tests. We put the airplane through it. And -

**David Friedberg**
Totally.

**Sam Altman**
It's different than reading all of your code.

**David Friedberg**
That's - that's - that's reviewing the output of the model.

**Sam Altman**
Yeah.

**David Friedberg**
Not reviewing the insides of the model.

**Sam Altman**
And - and - and so, what I was gonna say is - I - that is the kind of thing that, I think, as safety testing makes sense.

**David Friedberg**
How are we gonna get that to happen, Sam? And - and I'm not just speaking for OpenAI. I speak for the industry - for - for humanity because I am concerned that we draw ourselves into almost like a Dark Ages -

**Sam Altman**
Yeah.

**David Friedberg**
- type of era by restricting the growth of these incredible technologies that can prosper humanity - that humanity can prosper from so significantly. How do we change the - the sentiment and get that to happen? Because this is all moving so quickly at the government levels. And folks seem to be getting it wrong. And I'm - I'm - I'm, personally, concerned. Yeah.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Well, just to - just to build on that, Sam. The architectural decision, for example, that Llama took is pretty interesting in that it's like we're gonna let Llama grow and be as unfettered as possible. And we have this other kind of thing that we call Llama Guard that's meant to be these protective guardrails. Is that how you see the problem being solved correctly? Or do you see that -

**Sam Altman**
Look, at the current - at the current strength of models - definitely some things are gonna go wrong. And I don't want to like make light of those or not take those seriously. But I'm not like - I don't have any like catastrophic risk worries with a GPT-4-level model. And I think there's many safe ways to choose to deploy this. Maybe we'd find more common ground if we said that - and I think like - you know - the specific example of models that are capable - that are technically capable - not - even if they're not gonna be used this way - of recursive self-improvement or of - you know - autonomously designing and deploying a bioweapon or something like that.

**David Friedberg**
Or a new model.

**Sam Altman**
That was the recursive self-improvement point.

**David Friedberg**
Yeah, right.

**Sam Altman**
You know we should have safety testing on the outputs at an international level for models that - you know - have a reasonable chance of - of posing a threat there. I don't think like GPT-4, of course, does not pose any - any sort of - well, I don't say "any sort" because we don't - yeah, I don't think the GPT-4 poses a material threat on those kinds of things. And I think there's many safe ways to release a model like this. But you know - when like significant loss of human life is a serious possibility - like airplanes or any number of other examples where I think we're happy to have some sort of testing framework. Like I don't think about an airplane when I get on it. I just assume it's gonna be safe.

**David Friedberg**
Right. Right.

**Jason Calacanis**
There's a lot of hand-ringing right now, Sam, about jobs. And you had a lot of - I think you did like some sort of a test, when you were at YC, about UBI. And you've been public -

**Sam Altman**
Our results on that come out very soon. Just - it was a 5-year study that wrapped up or started 5 years ago. Well, there was like a beta study first. And there was like a long one that ran. But -

**Jason Calacanis**
Ballpark. What - what did you learn about that?

**David Friedberg**
Can you explain what - yeah, why'd you start? Why'd you start it? Maybe just explain UBI and why you started it?

**Sam Altman**
So, we started thinking about this in 2016 - kind of about the same time we started taking AI really seriously. And the theory was that the magnitude of the change that may come to society, and jobs in the economy, and - and sort of - in some deeper sense than that, like what the social contract looks like - meant that we should have many studies to study many ideas about new - new ways to arrange that. I - I also think that - you know - I'm not like a super fan of how the government has handled most policies designed to help poor people. And I kind of believe that if you could just give people money they would make good decisions. The market would do its thing. And you know - I'm very much in favor of lifting up the floor and reducing/eliminating poverty. But I'm interested in better ways to do that than what we have tried for - the existing social safety net and - and kind of the way things have been handled. And I think giving people money is not going to go solve all problems. It's certainly not going to make people happy. But it might - it might solve some problems and it

might give people a better horizon with which to help themselves. And I'm interested in that. I - I think that now that we see some of the ways - so, 2016 was very long time ago. Now that we see some of the ways that AI is developing, I wonder if there's better things to do than the traditional conceptualization of UBI. Like I wonder - I wonder if the future looks something like - more like universal basic compute than universal basic income. And everybody gets like a slice of GPT 7's compute and they can use it, they can resell it, they can donate it to somebody to use for cancer research. But - but what you get is not dollars. But this is like a -

**David Friedberg**
You get productivity.

**Sam Altman**
- slice. Yeah, you own like part of the productivity.

**David Friedberg**
Right.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
I would like to shift to the gossip part of this.

**Sam Altman**
Okay.

**Jason Calacanis**
Gossip? What gossip?

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Sam, let's go back - let's go back to November. What the flying fucking happened?

**Sam Altman**
You know - I - I - if you have specific questions, I'm happy to - maybe I answer. Maybe I won't. But I -

**Jason Calacanis**
You said you were going to talk about it at some point. So, here's the point. What the hell happened? You were fired. You came back. I mean - it was a palace intrigue. Did somebody stab you in the back? Did you find AGI? What's going on? Tell us. This is a safe space, Sam.

**Sam Altman**
I was fired. I was - I talked about coming back. I kind of was a little bit unsure at the moment about what I wanted to do because I was very upset. And I realized that I really loved OpenAI

and the people, and that I would come back, and I kind of - I knew it was going to be hard. It was even harder than I thought. But I - I kind of was like, "Alright, fine." I agreed to come back. The board like took a while to figure things out and then - you know - we were kind of like trying to keep the team together, and keep doing things for our customers, and - you know - sort of started making out of plans. And then, the board decided to hire a different interim CEO. And then, everybody - or many people -

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Oh, my gosh. What was - what was that guy's name? He was there for like a Scaramucci, right? Like -

**Sam Altman**
Emmett Shear. Emmett Shear. Emmett - Emmett - Emmett's great. And I - I have nothing but good thing about Emmett and that whole process.

**David Friedberg**
A Scaramucci.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Here was here for a Scaramucci.

**Sam Altman**
And then -

**Jason Calacanis**
Where were you when they - when you found the news that you've been fired? Like, take me to that moment.

**Sam Altman**
I was in Vegas. I was at a hotel room in Vegas for F1 weekend.

**David Sacks**
I think that's happened to you before, JCal.

**Jason Calacanis**
So, you're there and what did you - get a text and you're like -

**Sam Altman**
What did you say, David?

**Jason Calacanis**
"You're fired. Pick up your package."

**David Sacks**
I said I think that's happened to you before, JCal.

**Jason Calacanis**
I - I'm trying to think if I ever got fired. I don't think I've gotten fired. But -

**Sam Altman**
Yeah, I got a text.

**Jason Calacanis**
It's a - it's - no, it's just a weird thing. Like, it's a text from who?

**Sam Altman**
Actually, no. I got a text the night before. And then, I got on a phone call with the board. And then, that was that. And then, I kind of like - I mean - then, everything went crazy. I was like - it was like - I mean - I have - my phone was like unusable. It was just a nonstop vibrating thing of like text messages and calling.

**David Sacks**
Basically, you got fired by tweet. That happened a few times during the Trump administration. A few -

**Sam Altman**
They did call me first -

**David Sacks**
- cabinet appointments got - got tweeted out.

**Sam Altman**
- before - before tweeting -

**David Sacks**
Oh, okay.

**Sam Altman**
- which was nice of them. And then, like - you know - I kind of did like a few hours of just this like absolute fugue state in the hotel room trying to like - I was just confused beyond belief trying to figure out what to do. And -

**Jason Calacanis**
So, weird.

**Sam Altman**
And then, like flew home at - maybe like - I got on a plane at like - I don't know - 3pm or something like that. Still just like - you know - crazy nonstop phone blowing up. Met up with some people in person. By that evening, I was like, "Okay, you know - I'll just like go do AGI research." And was feeling pretty happy about the future and -

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah, you have options.

**Sam Altman**
And then - and then the next morning, I had this call with a couple of board members about coming back and that led to a few more days of craziness. And then - and then it kind of - I think it got resolved. Well, it was like a lot of insanity in between.

**David Sacks**
What - what percent of - what percent of it was because of these nonprofit board members?

**Sam Altman**
Well, we only have a nonprofit board. So, it was all the nonprofit board members. Their - the board had gotten down to six people. They - and then, they removed Greg from the board. And then, fired me. So - but it was like - you know -

**David Sacks**
But I mean - like was there a culture clash between the people on the board who had only nonprofit experience versus the people who had startup experience?

**David Friedberg**
And maybe you can share a little bit about - if you're willing to - the motivation behind the action. Anything you can -

**Sam Altman**
I think there's always been culture clashes at - look, obviously, not all of those board members are my favorite people in the world. But I have serious respect for the gravity with which they treat AGI and the importance of getting AI safety right. And even if I stringently disagree with their decision making and actions - which I do - I have never once doubted their integrity or commitment to the sort of shared mission of safe and beneficial AGI. You know, do I think they like made good decisions in the process of that or - kind of - know how to balance all the things OpenAI has to get right? No. But - but I think the like -

**Jason Calacanis**
The intent.

**Sam Altman**
The intent of - the magnitude of -

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**Sam Altman**
- AGI and getting that right. I -

**David Sacks**
Actually, let - let me ask you about that. So, the mission of OpenAI is, explicitly, to create AGI - which I think is really interesting. A lot of people would say that, "If we create AGI, that would be like an unintended consequence of something gone horribly wrong." And they're very afraid of that outcome. But OpenAI makes that the actual mission.

**Sam Altman**
Yeah.

**David Sacks**
Does that create like more fear about what you're doing? I mean - I understand it can create motivation too. But how do you reconcile that? I guess - why is that?

**Sam Altman**
I think a lot of - I think a lot of the - well, I mean - first I'll say that - I'll answer the first question and the second one. I think it does create a great deal of fear. I think a lot of the world is, understandably, very afraid of AGI - or very afraid of even current AI. And - and - and very excited about it. And even more afraid. And even more excited about where it's going. And we - we wrestle with that, but like I think it is unavoidable that this is going to happen. I also think it's going to be tremendously beneficial. But we do have to navigate how to get there in a reasonable way. And like a lot of stuff is going to change. And change is - you know - pretty - pretty uncomfortable for people. So, there's a lot of pieces that we got to get right. And -

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Can I ask a -

**Sam Altman**
Sure.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Can I ask different question? You have created - I mean - it's the hottest company. And you are, literally, at the center of the center of the center. But then, it's so unique in the sense that all of this value, you eschewed economically. Can you just like walk us through like why?

**Sam Altman**
Yeah, I wish I had taken - I wish I had taken equity, so I never had to answer this question. If I could go back in time -

**David Sacks**
But why don't they give - why they don't give you a grant now?

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Yeah, why don't they -

**David Sacks**
Why doesn't the board just give you a big option grant like you deserve?

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah, give you five points.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
What was the decision back then? Like why was that so important to do?

**Sam Altman**
The decision back then - the reason - the original reason was just like the structure of our nonprofit. It was - like there was something about, "Yeah, okay. This is like nice from a motivations perspective." But mostly, it was that our board needed to be a majority of disinterested directors. And I was like, "That's fine. I don't need equity right now." I kind of - but like I mean - I wish -

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
But in this weird way, now that you're running a company - yeah, it like - it creates these weird questions of like, "Well, what's your real motivation?", versus -

**Sam Altman**
Totally. Totally. I - that's - that - it - I - it is so deeply unimaginable - I - I - one thing I have noticed. It is just - it's so deeply unimaginable to people to say -

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Yeah.

**Sam Altman**
"I don't really need more money." Like - and I how tone-deaf -

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Well, no. People think - I think - I think people think it's a little bit of an ulterior motive - I think is why -

**Sam Altman**
Well, yeah. Yeah, yeah, yeah. No, it's - so, it assumes - you assume that it's like -

**David Friedberg**
Right. It's like: What else is he doing on the side to make money?

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**David Friedberg**
Something sketchy is going on.

**Sam Altman**
If I were - if I were just trying to - let's say like, "I'm going to try to make a trillion dollars with OpenAI", I think everybody would have an easier time and it would -

**David Friedberg**
Totally. Totally.

**Sam Altman**
- save me. It would save a lot of conspiracy theories.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Totally. Totally.

**Jason Calacanis**
Sam, this is the back channel. You are a great dealmaker. I've - I've watched your career. I mean - you're just great at it. You've got all these connections. You're really good at raising money. You're fantastic at it. And you got this Jony Ives thing going. You're in Humane. You're investing in companies. You got the orb. You're raising $7 trillion to build the fabs - all this stuff.

**Sam Altman**
News to me.

**Jason Calacanis**
All of that put together.

**David Friedberg**
JCal loves fake news.

**David Sacks**
JCal loves fake news.

**David Friedberg**
He loves fake news.

**Jason Calacanis**
I'm kind of being a little facetious here. Obviously, it's not - you're not raising $7 trillions, but maybe that's the market cap of something. Putting all that aside, the tea was you're doing all these deals. They don't trust you because: What's your motivation? You - you - you're end-running. And what opportunities belong inside of OpenAI? What opportunities should be Sam's? And this group of nonprofit people didn't trust you.

**Sam Altman**
Yeah.

**Jason Calacanis**
Is that what happens?

**Sam Altman**
So, the things like - you know - device companies or if we were doing some chip fab companies - like those are not Sam's projects. Those would be like - OpenAI would get that equity.

**Jason Calacanis**
They would? Okay, that's not -

**Sam Altman**
Oh, yeah.

**Jason Calacanis**
- the public's perception.

**Sam Altman**
Well, that's not like kind of the people like you who have to like commentate on this stuff all day's perception - which is fair because we have an announced stuff

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**Sam Altman**
because it's not done. I don't think most people in the world are thinking about this. But I - I - I - I agree it spins up a lot of conspiracies - conspiracy theories in like tech commentators.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah, in a vacuum. Yeah.

**Sam Altman**
And if I could go back - yeah - I would just say like, "Let me take equity and make that super clear." And then, everybody would be like, "Alright." I'd still be doing it because I really care about AGI and think this is the most interesting work in the world. But it would at least type-check to everybody.

**Jason Calacanis**
What's the chip project? That the $7 trillion - and where did 7 trillion number come from? It makes no sense.

**Sam Altman**
I don't know where that came from, actually.

**Jason Calacanis**
Okay.

**Sam Altman**
I genuinely don't. I think - I think the world needs a lot more AI infrastructure - a lot more - than it's currently planning to build. And with a different cost structure. The exact way for us to play there is - we're still trying to figure that out.

**Jason Calacanis**
Got it.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
What's your preferred model of organizing OpenAI? Is it sort of like the "move fast break things", highly distributed, small teams? Or is it more of this organized effort where you need to plan because you want to prevent some of these edge cases?

**Sam Altman**
Oh, I have to go in a minute. It's not because - it's not to prevent the edge cases that we need to be more organized. But it is that these systems are so complicated and concentrating

bets are so important. Like one - you know - at the time, before it was obvious to do this, you have like DeepMind or whatever has all these different teams doing all these different things and they're spreading their bets out. And -

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Right.

**Sam Altman**
- you had OpenAI say, "We're going to like, basically, bet the whole company and work together to make GPT-4." And that was like unimaginable for how to run an AI research lab. But it is, I think, what works - that at a minimum, it's what works for us. So, not because we're trying to prevent edge cases, but because we want to concentrate resources and do these like big, hard, complicated things, we do have a lot of coordination on what we work on.

**Jason Calacanis**
Alright, Sam. I know you've got to go. You've been great on the hour. Come back any time. And -

**Sam Altman**
Great talking to you guys.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah. It was wonderful.

**David Friedberg**
Yeah, it was fun. Thanks for coming out. I -

**Jason Calacanis**
Thanks for being so open about it. We're appreciative.

**David Friedberg**
We've been talking about it for like a - a year plus to have Sam come and chat.

**Sam Altman**
I'm really happy it finally happened.

**David Friedberg**
Yeah, it's awesome.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**David Friedberg**
I really appreciate it.

**Sam Altman**
I would love to come back on after our next like major launch and I'll -

**David Friedberg**
You're - you're -

**Sam Altman**
- be able to talk more directly about some of these thing.

**David Friedberg**
Definitely. Let's - let's -

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah, you've got to Zoom link. Same Zoom link -

**David Friedberg**
Yeah.

**Jason Calacanis**
- every week. Just same time. Same link. Just drop in.

**David Friedberg**
Just drop in.

**Jason Calacanis**
Please just drop in.

**David Friedberg**
Drop in.

**Jason Calacanis**
Just put in on your calendar. Alright, everybody.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Come back to the game. Come back to the game.

**David Friedberg**
Oh, yeah. We haven't seen you at poker in a while.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah, come back to the game.

**Sam Altman**
I - I - you know - I would love to play poker. It has been forever. That would be a lot of fun.

**David Friedberg**
Yeah. Come and hang out.

**Sam Altman**
Send me an invite. I'll come.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah. That famous hand where Chamath - when you and I were heads up and you - you had - remember -

**Sam Altman**
I don't remember. Remind me.

**Jason Calacanis**
You and I were heads up. And you went all in. I had a set. But there was a straight and a flush on the board. And I'm in the tank trying to figure out if I want to lose - this was back when we would play small stakes. It might have been like $5k pot or something. And then, Chamath can't stay out of the pot. And he starts taunting the two of us, "You should call. You shouldn't call. He's bluffing. He's..." And I'm like, "Chamath, I'm going - I'm - I'm trying to figure out if I make the call here." I make the call. And it was like - you had a really good hand. And I - but I just happened to have a set. I think you had the top pair top kicker or something. But you - you made a great move because the board was so textured. Almost like, "Oh, bottom set."

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Sam has a great style of playing, which I would call "ram and jam".

**David Friedberg**
Totally.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
You gotta just get out of the way.

**Sam Altman**
I - Chamath, I don't really know if you can - I don't - I don't know if you can say that about anybody else. I don't - I don't - I'm not going to -

**David Friedberg**
You haven't seen him out playing the last 18 months. It's a lot different.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
I've - I've tightened it up.

**Jason Calacanis**
Come back to the game.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
I'm much more snug.

**Jason Calacanis**
It's much more so much fun now.

**Sam Altman**
I find - I find that really hard to do believe.

**Jason Calacanis**
Have you played bomb pot before? Have you played bomb pots? You know this game?

**Sam Altman**
I don't know what that is.

**David Friedberg**
Okay, you'll love it. We'll see you next time.

**Jason Calacanis**
Alright, this game is nuts. You - it's PLO but you have two boards. It's nuts.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Thank you. Sam, thank you. And - and congrats on everything, honestly.

**Sam Altman**
Thank you, Chamath.

**David Sacks**
Thanks for coming on and -

**Sam Altman**
Thanks, Sam.

**David Sacks**
- we would love to have you back when the next - after the big launch.

**Sam Altman**
Sounds good.

**David Friedberg**
Yeah, please do.

**David Sacks**
Cool.

**Sam Altman**
Bye.

**Jason Calacanis**
Gentlemen, some breaking news here. All those projects, he said, are part of OpenAI. That's something people didn't know before this. And a lot of confusion there. Chamath, what was your major takeaway from our hour with Sam?

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
I think that these guys are going to be one of the four major companies -

**Jason Calacanis**
Okay.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
- that matter in this whole space. I think that that's clear. I think what's still unclear is where the economics is going to be. He said something very discrete, but I thought was important, which is I think he basically - my interpretation is - these models will roughly all be the same, but there's going to be a lot of scaffolding around these models that actually allow you to build these apps. So in many ways, that is like the open-source movement. So, even if the model itself is never open-source, it doesn't much matter because you have to pay for the infrastructure, right? There's a lot of open-source software that runs on Amazon. You still pay AWS something. So, I think the right way to think about this, now, is the models will basically be all really good.

**Jason Calacanis**
Mmmhmm.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
And then, it's all this other stuff that you'll have to pay for.

**Jason Calacanis**
The interface. Yeah.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Whoever builds all this other stuff is going to be in a position to build a really good business.

**Jason Calacanis**
Friedberg, he talked a lot about reasoning. It seemed like that - he kept going to reasoning and away from the language model. Did you note - did you note that? And anything else that you noted in our hour with Sam?

**David Friedberg**
Yeah, I mean - that's a longer conversation because there is a lot of talk about language models eventually evolving to be so generalizable that they can resolve pretty much like all intelligent function. And so, the language model is the foundational model that - that yielded AGI. But that's a - I think - there's a lot of people that have different schools of thought on this and how much -

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Oh, my - my other takeaway, I think, is that the - I think what he also seemed to indicate is there's like so many - like we're also enraptured by LLMs, but there's so many things other than LLMs that are being baked and rolled by him and by other groups. And I think we have to pay some amount of attention to all those because that's probably where - and I think, Friedberg, you tried to go there in your question - that's where reasoning will really come from - is this mixture-of-experts approach. And so, you're going to have to think multi-dimensionally to reason, right? We do that, right? Do I cross the street or not in this point in time? You reason based on all these multi-inputs. And so, there's - there's all these little systems that go into making that decision in your brain. And if you - if you use that as a simple example, there's all this stuff that has to go into making some experience being able to reason intelligently.

**Jason Calacanis**
Sacks, you went right there with the corporate structure - the board. And he - he - he gave us a lot more information here. What are your thoughts on the, "Hey..." - you know - "...the chip stuff and the other stuff I'm working on, that's all part of OpenAI. People just don't realize it." And - and that moment and then - you know - your questions to him about equity. Your - your thoughts on that?

**David Sacks**
I'm not sure I was like the main guy who asked that question, JCal. But -

**Jason Calacanis**
Well, no. You did talk about the - the nonprofit. The - the difference between the nonprofit versus -

**David Sacks**
Well, yeah. I had a follow-up question about the - the -

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah. Yeah. That's what I'm talking about.

**David Sacks**
There clearly was some sort of culture clash on the board -

**Jason Calacanis**
Yes.

**David Sacks**
- between the - the people who originated from the nonprofit world and the people who came from the startup world.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
And the tech side. Yeah.

**David Sacks**
We don't really know more than that, but there clearly was some sort of culture clash. I thought one of the - a couple of the other areas that he drew attention to that were kind of interesting is he clearly thinks there's a big opportunity on mobile -

**Jason Calacanis**
Yes.

**David Sacks**
- that goes beyond just like having - you know - a ChatGPT app on your phone or maybe even having like a Siri on your phone. There's clearly something bigger there. He doesn't know exactly what it is, but it's going to require more inputs. It's that - you know - personal assistant that's seeing everything around you and helping you.

**Jason Calacanis**
That was a really - I think that's a great insight, David, because he was talking about, "Hey, I'm looking for a senior team member who can push back on me and understands all context." I thought that was like a very - interesting to think about.

**David Sacks**
Yeah, he's talking about an executive assistant or an assistant that has executive function as opposed to being like just an alter ego -

**Jason Calacanis**
Yes.

**David Sacks**
- for you or what he called a sychophant. That's kind of interesting.

**Jason Calacanis**
I thought that was interesting. Yeah.

**David Sacks**
Yeah. And clearly he thinks there's a big opportunity in biology and scientific discovery.

**David Friedberg**
After the break, I think we should talk about AlphaFold 3. It was just announced today. So, yeah.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah, let's do that. And we can talk about the - the Apple ad in depth. I just want to also make sure people understand. When people come on the pod, we don't show them questions. They don't edit the transcript. Nothing is out of bounds. If you were wondering why I didn't ask - or we didn't ask about the Elon lawsuit, he's just not going to be able to comment on that. So, it would be a, "No comment." So, you know -

**David Friedberg**
And we're not sure -

**David Sacks**
I agree. Like our time was limited and there's a lot of questions that we could have asked him that would have just been a waste of time. And frankly, he's already been asked -

**Jason Calacanis**
Well, they would have thought - it would have been, "No comment." So, I just want to make sure people understand that.

**David Sacks**
Yeah, of course, he's going to, "No comment." on any lawsuit. And he's already been asked about that 500 times.

**David Friedberg**
Alright.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yes.

**David Friedberg**
Should we take a quick break before the next - before we come back?

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah, let's take a bile break. And then, we'll come back with some news for you and some more banter with your favorite besties on the #1 podcast in the world - the All-In Podcast.

[ Break ]

**Jason Calacanis**
Alright, welcome back everybody. Second half of the show. Great guest. Sam Altman, thanks for coming on the pod. We've got a bunch of news on the docket. So, let's get started. Friedberg, you told me I could give some names of the guests that we booked for the All-in Summit.

**David Friedberg**
I did not.

**Jason Calacanis**
You did. You've said each week - every week - that I get to say some names.

**David Friedberg**
I did not say that. I did not. I appreciate your interest in the All-in Summit's lineup, but we do not yet have enough critical mass -

**Jason Calacanis**
Okay.

**David Friedberg**
- to feel like we should go out there.

**Jason Calacanis**
Well, I am a loose cannon. So, I will announce my two guests. And I - I created the Summit and you took it from me, so - and doing a great job - I will announce my guests. I don't care what your opinion is. I have booked two guests for the Summit and it's going to be sold out. Look at these two guests I've booked. For the third time coming back to the Summit, our

guy Elon Musk will be there. Hopefully, in person. If not, you know - from 40,000 feet on a StarLink connection wherever he is in the world. And for the first time, our friend Mark Cuban will be coming. And so, two great guests for you to look forward to. But Friedberg's got like a thousand guests coming. He'll tell you when it's like 48 hours before the conference. But you have two great guests coming.

**David Sacks**
Wait, speaking of billionaires who are coming, isn't [bleep] coming too?

**Jason Calacanis**
Yes, [bleep] is coming. Yes, he's booked.

**David Sacks**
So, we have three billionaires coming. Okay.

**Jason Calacanis**
Three billionaires. Yes.

**David Friedberg**
[bleep] hasn't fully confirmed, so don't -

**Jason Calacanis**
Okay, well. We're going to say it anyway. [bleep] has penciled in.

**David Friedberg**
Don't say it. You'll -

**David Sacks**
Don't back out.

**Jason Calacanis**
We'll say "penciled". Yeah, don't back out.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
This is going to be catnip for all these protest organizers. Like if you had to pick one place -

**Jason Calacanis**
Oh, God. Do not poke the bear.

**David Sacks**
Oh, by the way, speaking of updates -

**Jason Calacanis**
Oh.

**David Sacks**
What did you guys think of the bottle for the All-In tequila?

**Jason Calacanis**
Ooh.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Oh, beautiful. Honestly - honestly, I will just say I think you are doing a marvelous job. That - I was shocked at the design. "Shocked" meaning it is so unique and high quality. I think it's amazing.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
It would make me drink tequila.

**David Sacks**
You're going to. You're going to want to.

**Jason Calacanis**
You're going to. It is - is stunning. Just congratulations. And yeah, it was just - it - when we went through the deck at the - at the monthly meeting, it was like, "Oh, that's nice. Oh, that's nice." We were going through the concept bottles. And then, that bottle came up and everybody went like crazy. It was like somebody hitting like a - Steph Curry hitting a half-court shot. It was like, "Oh, my God!"

**David Sacks**
Yeah.

**Jason Calacanis**
It was just so clear that you've made an iconic bottle that - if we can produce it, "Oh, Lord." It is going to be -

**David Sacks**
Looks like we can. The -

**Jason Calacanis**
Oh, it's looking good?

**David Friedberg**
That's awesome.

**David Sacks**
Looks like we can it. Yeah.

**David Friedberg**
It's gonna be amazing.

**Jason Calacanis**
I'm excited. I'm excited for it. You know, it's like for the things -

**David Sacks**
I mean - the bottle design is so complicated that we had to do a feasibility analysis on whether it was actually manufacturable. But it is, so -

**Jason Calacanis**
Oh.

**David Sacks**
Or at least, the early reports are good. So, we're going to - hopefully, we'll have some made for the - in time for the All-In Summit.

**Jason Calacanis**
I mean -

**David Friedberg**
Amazing.

**Jason Calacanis**
Why not? Sounds great.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
I mean - it's great. When we get barricaded in by all these protesters, we can drink the tequila. Did you guys see - did you see Peter Thiel?

**Jason Calacanis**
Yo, what happened to your boy, Peter Thiel?

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Peter Thiel got barricaded by these ding-dongs at Cambridge. My God.

**Jason Calacanis**
Listen, people have the right to protest. I think it's great people are protesting, but surrounding people and threatening them is a little bit over the top and dangerous.

**David Sacks**
I think you're exaggerating what happened.

**Jason Calacanis**
Well, I don't know exactly what happened because all we see is these videos.

**David Sacks**
Look, they're not threatening anybody. And I don't even think they tried to barricade him in. They were just outside the building -

**Jason Calacanis**
Ah.

**David Sacks**
- and because they're blocking the driveway, his car couldn't leave.

**Jason Calacanis**
Got it.

**David Sacks**
But he wasn't physically like locked in the building or something.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah, that - that - that's - that's what headlines say. But that could be fake news / fake social. Yeah.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
This was not on my bingo card. This pro-protestor support by Sacks was not on the bingo card. I've got to say. I didn't see it coming.

**David Sacks**
The Constitution - the Constitution of the United States, in the First Amendment, provides for the right of assembly -

**Jason Calacanis**
Yes.

**David Sacks**
- which includes protest and sit-ins as long as they're -

**Jason Calacanis**
It's beautiful. Yeah.

**David Sacks**
- as on as they're peaceable. Now, obviously, if they go too far and they vandalize, or break into buildings, or use violence, then that's not peaceable. However, expressing sentiments with which you disagree does not make it violent. And there's all these people out there now making the argument that if you hear something from a protestor that you don't like, and you subjectively experience that as a - as a threat to your safety, then that's somehow - it should be - you know - treated as valid. Like that's, basically, violent. Well, that's - that's not what the Constitution says. And these people understood well, just a few months ago, that that was basically snowflakery. That - you know - just because somebody - you know what I'm saying? Like we now have the -

**Jason Calacanis**
"Snowflakery" - "peaceable" - we have all these great words.

**David Sacks**
We have the - we have the rise the woke right now where they're buying into the -

**Jason Calacanis**
The woke right?

**David Sacks**
Yeah, the woke right. They're buying into this idea of safetyism, which is being exposed to ideas you don't like - to protests you don't like - is a threat to your safety. No, it's not. Even if they are saying things you don't like.

**Jason Calacanis**
So, now we have snowflakes on both sides. Everybody's being -

**David Sacks**
We absolutely have snowflakery on both sides now.

**Jason Calacanis**
It's ridiculous. It - the only thing I will say that I've seen and - is this - this - this surrounding individuals who you don't want there and locking them in a circle. And then, moving them out of like the protest area.

**David Sacks**
Yeah, obviously, you can't do that.

**Jason Calacanis**
That's not cool. Yeah.

**David Sacks**
Yeah, obviously, you can't do that. But look. I think that most of the protests on most of the campuses have not crossed the line. They've just occupied the lawns of these campuses. And look. I've seen some troublemakers try to barge through the - the encampments and claim that because they can't go through there, that somehow, they're somehow being prevented from going to class. Look, you just walk around the lawn -

**Jason Calacanis**
Yes.

**David Sacks**
- and you can get to class, okay?

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**David Sacks**
And you know - some of these videos are showing that these are, effectively, right-wing provocateurs who are engaging in left-wing tactics. And I don't support it either way.

**Jason Calacanis**
Chaos ensues.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
By the way, some of these camps are some of the funniest things you've ever seen. It's like - there are like at one tent that's dedicated to like a reading room. And you go in there and there's like - these like fur blankets.

**Jason Calacanis**
Mindfulness center.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Oh, my God. It's unbelievably hilarious.

**David Sacks**
Look, there's - there's no question that because the protests are originating on the left, that there's some goofy views like - you know - you're dealing with like a left-wing idea complex, right? But - and then - you know - it's easy to make fun of them doing different things. But the fact of matter is that most of the protests and most of these campuses are - even though they can be annoying because they're occupying part of the lawn - they're not violent.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**David Sacks**
And you know - the way - the way they're being cracked down on. They're sending the police in at 5am to crack down on these encampments with batons and riot gear. And I find that part to be completely excessive.

**Jason Calacanis**
Well, it's also dangerous because - you know - things can escalate when you have mobs of people and large groups of people. So, I just want to make sure people understand that. Large group of people - large - you have a diffusion of responsibility that occurs when there's large groups of people who are passionate about things. And - and people can get hurt. People have gotten killed at these things. So, just - you know - keep it calm, everybody. I agree with you. Like what's the harm of these folks protesting on a lawn? It's not a big deal. When they break into buildings, of course -

**David Sacks**
Yeah. Then it crosses the line, obviously.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah. But I mean - let them sit out there. And then, they'll run out their food cards - their - their - their - their campus food cards and they'll run out of waffles.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
I - I like the clip. Did you guys see the clip? I think it was on the University of Washington campus where one kid challenged this antifa guy to a push-up contest.

**Jason Calacanis**
Oh, fantastic.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
I mean - it's - it is some of the funniest stuff. Some of the - some content is coming out that is just hilarious.

**Jason Calacanis**
Well, I did see - my favorite was the woman who came out and said that the Columbia students needed humanitarian aid and they needed -

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Oh, my God. The overdubs on her were hilarious.

**Jason Calacanis**
I was like, "Humanitarian aid? On the..." And it was like, "We need our DoorDash right now. We need to be double dashed some boba and we can't get it through the - the police. We need our boba." Low-sugar boba with the - with the popping boba bubbles wasn't getting in. But you know - people have the right to protest. And "peaceable", by the way. There's a word I've never heard. Very good, Sacks. "Peaceable" - inclined to avoid argument or violent conflict. Very nice.

**David Sacks**
Well, it's in the Constitution. It's in the First Amendment.

**Jason Calacanis**
Is it really? I'm never - yeah, I haven't heard the word "peaceable" before. I mean - you and I are simpatico on this. Like I - I don't - we used to have the ACLU like backing up the KKK going down Main Street and really fighting for -

**David Sacks**
Yeah, the Skokie decision. Yeah.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah, they were really fighting for - and I - I - and I have to say the Overton window has opened back up. And I think it's great. Alright, we've got some things on the docket here. I don't know if you guys saw the Apple new iPad ad. It's getting a bunch of criticism. It - they used like some giant hydraulic press to crush a bunch of creative tools: DJ turntable, trumpet, piano. People really care about Apple's ads and what they represent. We talked about that Mother Earth little vignette they created here. What do you think, Friedberg? Did you see the ad? What was your reaction to it?

**David Friedberg**
It made me sad. It made - it did not make me want to buy an iPad. So, did not seem like a good - yeah.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
It made - it made you sad, really? It actually elicited an emotion? Meaning like commercials - it's very rare that commercials can actually do that. Most people just zone out.

**David Friedberg**
Yeah. They took all this beautiful stuff and hurt it. It didn't - it didn't feel good. I don't know. It just didn't seem like a good ad. I don't know why they did that. I don't get it. I - I've - I - I don't know. It seems bad.

**David Sacks**
Well, I think - I think maybe what they're trying to do is - the - the selling point of this new iPad is that it's the thinnest one. I mean - there's no innovation left. So, they're just making the devices -

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**David Sacks**
- you know - thinner.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah. Smaller.

**David Sacks**
So, I think the idea was that they were going to take this hydraulic press to represent how ridiculously thin the new iPad is. Now, I don't know if the point there was to smush all of that good stuff into the iPad. I don't know if that's what they were trying to convey. But yeah. I - I think that by destroying all those creative tools that Apple is supposed to represent, it definitely seemed very off-brand for them. And I think people are - were reacting to the fact that it was so different than what they would have done in the past. And of course, everyone was saying, "Well, Steve would never have done this." I do think it did land wrong. I mean - I - I didn't care that much. But I - I was kind of asking the question like, "Why are they destroying all these creator tools that they're renowned for creating - or for turning into the digital version?

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah, it just didn't land. I mean - Chamath, how - how are you doing emotionally after seeing that? Are you okay, buddy?

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Yeah. I think this is - you guys see that in the Berkshire annual meeting last weekend, Tim Cook was in the audience and Buffett was very laudatory, "This is an incredible company." But he's so clever with words. He's like, you know - "This is an incredible business that we will hold forever... most likely." And it turns out that he sold $20 billion worth of Apple shares in the quarter.

**Jason Calacanis**
Caveat. "We're going to hold it forever. Sell! Sell!"

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Which - which by the way - if you guys remember, we - we put that little chart up which shows when he doesn't mention it in the - in the annual letter -

**Jason Calacanis**
Big tell.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
It's basically like - it's foreshadowing the fact that he is just pounding the sell. And he sold $20 billion.

**David Sacks**
Well also, "holding it forever" could mean one share.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Yeah, exactly.

**David Sacks**
We kind of need to know like how much -

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Exactly.

**David Sacks**
- are we talking about?

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
I mean - it's an incredible business that has so much money with nothing to do. They're probably just going to buy back the stock. Just a total waste.

**Jason Calacanis**
They were floating this rumor of buying Rivian - you know - after they shut down Titan project, their internal project to make a car. It seems like a car is the only thing people can think of that would move the needle in terms of earnings.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
I think the problem is, JCal, like you kind of become afraid of your own shadow. Meaning the - the folks that are really good at M&A - like you look at Benioff. The thing with Benioff's M&A strategy is that he's been doing it for 20 years.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
And so, he's cut his teeth on small acquisitions and the market learns to give him trust. So, that when he proposes like the $27 billion Slack acquisition, he's allowed to do that. Another guy - you know - Nikesh Arora at PANW. These last 5 years, people were very skeptical that he could actually roll up security because it was a super fragmented market. He's gotten permission. Then, there are companies like Danaher that buy hundreds of companies. So, all of these folks are examples of: You start small and you - you earn the right to do more. Apple hasn't bought anything more than 50 or 100 million dollars. And so, the idea that all of a sudden they come out of the blue and buy a $10-20 billion company, I think, is just totally - doesn't stand logic. It's just not possible for them because they'll be so afraid of their own shadow. That's the big problem. It's themselves.

**David Sacks**
Well, the - if you're running out of in-house innovation and you can't do M&A, then your options are kind of limited.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Totally.

**David Sacks**
I mean - I do think that the fact that the big news out of Apple is the iPad is getting thinner does represent kind of the end of the road in terms of innovation. It's kind of like when they added the third camera to the iPhone.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**David Sacks**
It reminds me of those - remember like when the Gillette -

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah, they did the 5.

**David Sacks**
- Mach3 came out. And then, they did the 5.

**Jason Calacanis**
It was the best Onion thing. It was like, "We're doing 5, F-it. Fuck it, we're doing 5."

**David Sacks**
But then - but then, Gillette actually came out with the Mach5. So -

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**David Sacks**
Like the parody became the reality. What are they going to do? Add two more cameras to the iPhone? You have five cameras on it?

**Jason Calacanis**
Right. Right. Yeah, it makes no sense. And then, I don't know anybody who wants the - remember the Apple Vision was like going to change everything?

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Plus, why they're body shaming the - the fat iPads?

**Jason Calacanis**
That's fair point. Fair point. Actually, you know what? It's actually - I - actually, this didn't come out yet. But it turns out the iPad is on Ozempic. It's actually dropped a lot of weight.

**David Sacks**
That would have been a funnier ad.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Yeah, exactly.

**Jason Calacanis**
"O - O - O...Ozempic..." We can just workshop that right here. But there's another funny one which was making the iPhone smaller, and smaller, and smaller - and the iPads smaller, and smaller, and smaller - to the point where it was like - you know - like a thumb-sized iPhone.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Like the Ben Stiller phone in Zoolander.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yes, correct. Yeah.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
That was a great scene.

**Jason Calacanis**
Is there a category that you can think of that you would love an Apple product for? There's a product in your life that you would love to have Apple's version of it?

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Yes! They - they killed it. I think a lot of people would be very open-minded to an Apple car.

**Jason Calacanis**
Okay.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
They - they just would. It's a connected internet device - increasingly so.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
And they - they managed to flub it.

**Jason Calacanis**
Hmm.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
They had a chance to buy Tesla. They managed to flub it.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Right? There are just too many examples here where these guys have so much money and not enough ideas. That's a shame.

**Jason Calacanis**
It's a bummer. Yeah. The one I always wanted to see them do, Sacks, was -

**David Sacks**
TV?

**Jason Calacanis**
The one I always wanted to see them do was the TV and they were supposedly working on it. Like the actual TV -

**David Sacks**
Yeah.

**Jason Calacanis**
- not the little Apple TV box in the back. And like that would have been extraordinary to actually have a gorgeous - you know - big television.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
What about a gaming console? They could have done that, you know?

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
There's just all these things that they could have done. It's not a lack of imagination because these aren't exactly incredibly world-beating ideas. They're sitting right in front of your face. It's just the will to do it.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah. ,What do you think, Friedberg?

**David Sacks**
Yeah, the all-in-one TV would have been good.

**David Friedberg**
If you think back on Apple's product lineup over the years where they've really created value is on how unique the products are. They almost create new categories. Sure, there may have been a quote "tablet/computer" prior to the iPad, but the iPad really defined the tablet/computer-era. Sure, there was a smartphone or two before the iPhone came along, but it really defined the smartphone. And sure, there was a computer before the Apple II. And then, it came along and it defined the personal computer. In all these cases, I think Apple strives to define the category. So, it's very hard to define a television if you think about it - or a gaming console - in a way that you take a step up and you say, "This is the new thing. This is the new platform." So, I don't know. That's the lens I would look at if I'm Apple, in terms of like, "Can I redefine a car? Can I make..." You know, we're - we're - we're all trying

to fit them into an existing product bucket. But I think what they've always been so good at is identifying consumer needs and then creating an entirely new way of addressing that need in a real step change function. From the - like the - the - the iPod. It was so different from any MP3 player ever.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
I think the reason why the car could have been completely reimagined by Apple is that they have a level of credibility and trust that I think, probably, no other company has and absolutely no other tech company has. And we talked about this. But I - I think this was the third Steve Jobs story that - that I left out. But in 2000 and - I don't know - was it 1? I launched a 99-cent download store.

**David Friedberg**
Right.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
I think I've told you this story - in Winapp. And Steve Jobs just ran total circles around us. But the reason he was able to is he had all the credibility to go to the labels and get deals done for licensing music that nobody could get done before. I think that's an example of what Apple's able to do, which is to use their political capital to change the rules. So, if the thing that we would all want is safer roads and autonomous vehicles, there are regions in every town and city that could be completely converted to level-five autonomous zones. If I had to pick one company that had the credibility to go and change those rules, it's them because they could demonstrate that there was a methodical safe approach to doing something. And so, the point is that, even in these categories that could be totally reimagined, it's not for a lack of imagination. Again, it just goes back to a complete lack of will. And I understand because if they had - if you - if you had $200 billion of capital on your balance sheet, I think it's probably pretty easy to get fat and lazy.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah, it is. And they - and they want to have everything built there. People don't remember, but they actually built one of the first digital cameras. You must have owned this, right, Friedberg? You were - you were leading up ahead?

**David Friedberg**
Oh, I remember this. Yeah, totally.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah. It's beautiful. What did they call it? Was it the iCamera or something?

**David Friedberg**
QuickTake. QuickTake.

**Jason Calacanis**
QuickTake. Yeah. Yeah. The thing I would like to see Apple build - and I'm surprised they didn't - was a smart home system the way Apple has Nest - a drop cam, a door lock - you know - AV system. Go after Crestron or whatever. And just have your whole home automated - thermostat - Nest. All of that would be brilliant by Apple. And right now, I'm an Apple family that has our - all of our home automation through Google. So, it's just - it kind of sucks. I would - I would like that all to integrated.

**David Sacks**
Actually, that would be pretty amazing. Like if they did a Crestron or Savant. Because then, when you just go to your Apple TV, all your cameras just work. You don't need to -

**Jason Calacanis**
Yes. That's the - that - I mean - everybody has a home.

**David Sacks**
Right.

**Jason Calacanis**
And everybody automates their home, so just think -

**David Sacks**
Well, every - everyone has Apple TV at this point. So, you just make Apple TV the brain for the home system.

**Jason Calacanis**
Right. That would be your hub.

**David Sacks**
And you can connect your phone to it. And then, yes. That would be very nice.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah. Yeah. Like can you imagine like the Ring cameras - all that stuff being integrated? I don't know why they didn't go after that. That seems like the easy layup. Hey, you know - everybody's been talking, Friedberg, about this AlphaFold - this folding proteins. And there's some new version out from Google. And also Google, reportedly - we talked about this before - is also advancing talks to acquire HubSpot. So, that rumor - for the $30 billion market cap HubSpot - is out there as well. Friedberg, you're - as our resident science sultan - our resident sultan of science and as an Google alumni, pick either story and let's go for it.

**David Friedberg**

Yeah. I mean - I'm not sure there's much more to add on the HubSpot acquisition rumors. They are still just rumors. And I think we covered the topic a couple of weeks ago. But I will say that AlphaFold 3, that was just announced today and demonstrated by Google, is a real - I would say - breathtaking moment for biology, for bioengineering, for human health, for medicine. And maybe I'll just take 30 seconds to kind of explain it. You remember when they introduced AlphaFold - AlphaFold 2, we talked about DNA codes for proteins? So, every three letters of DNA codes for an amino acid. So, a string of DNA codes for a string of amino acids. And that's called a gene that produces a protein. And that protein is, basically, a - a long - like think about beads. There's 20 different types of beads - 20 different amino acids - that can be strung together. And what happens is that necklace - that bead necklace - basically collapses on itself. And all those will be stick together with each other in some complicated way that we can't deterministically model. And that creates a three-dimensional structure, which is called a protein - that molecule. And that molecule does something interesting. It can break apart other molecules. It can bind molecules. It can move molecules around. So, it's basically the machinery of chemistry - of - of biochemistry. And so, proteins are what is encoded in our DNA. And then, the proteins do all the work of making living organisms. So, Google's AlphaFold project took three-dimensional images of proteins. And the DNA sequence that codes for those proteins. And then, they built a predictive model that predicted the three-dimensional structure of a protein from the DNA that codes for it. And that was a huge breakthrough years ago. What they just announced with AlphaFold 3, today, is that they're now including all small molecules. So, all the other little molecules that go into chemistry and biology that drive the function of everything we see around us. And the way that all those molecules actually bind and fit together is part of the predictive model. Why is that important? Well, let's say that you're designing a new drug and it's a protein-based drug - which biological drugs - which most drugs are today. You can find a biological drug that binds to a cancer cell. And then, you'll spend 10 years going to clinical trials. And billions of dollars later, you find out that that protein accidentally binds to other stuff and hurts other stuff in the body. And that's an off-target effect or a side effect. And that drug is pulled from the clinical trials and it never goes to market. Most drugs go through that process. They are actually tested in - in animals and then in humans. And we find all these side effects that arise from those drugs because we don't know how those drugs are going to bind or interact with other things in our biochemistry. And we only discovered after we put it in. But now, we can actually model that with software. We can take that drug. We can create a three-dimensional representation of it using the software. And we can model how that drug might interact with all the other cells, all the other proteins, all the other small molecules in the body to find all the off-target effects that may arise and decide whether or not that presents a good drug candidate. That is one example of how this capability can be used. And there are many, many others - including creating new proteins that could be used to bind molecules or stick molecules together - or new proteins that could be designed to rip molecules apart. We can now predict the function of three-dimensional molecules using this - this capability - which

opens up all of the software-based design of chemistry, of biology, of drugs. And it really is an incredible breakthrough moment. The interesting thing that happened, though, is Google / Alphabet has a subsidiary called Isomorphic Labs. It is a drug development subsidiary of Alphabet. And they've basically kept all the IP for AlphaFold 3 in Isomorphic. So, Google is going to monetize the heck out of this capability. And what they made available was not open-source code, but a web-based viewer, that scientists for quote "non-commercial purposes" can use to do some fundamental research in a web-based viewer, and make some experiments, and try stuff out, and how interactions might occur. But no one can use it for commercial use. Only Google's Isomorphic Labs can. So number one, it's an incredible demonstration of what AI - outside of LLMs - which we just talked about with Sam today. And obviously, we talked about other models. But LLMs being - kind of - this consumer text predictive model capability. But outside of that, there's this capability in things like chemistry with these new AI models that can be trained and built to predict things like three-dimensional chemical interactions that is going to open up an entirely new era for - you know - human progress. And I think that's what's so exciting. I think the other side of this is Google has hugely advantaged. And they just showed the world a little bit about some of these jewels that they have in the treasure chest. And they're like, "Look at what we got. We're going to make all these drugs." And they've got partnerships with all these pharma companies at Isomorphic Labs that they've talked about. And it's going to usher in a new era of drug development and design for human health. So all in all, it's a pretty like astounding day. A lot of people are going crazy over the capability that they just demonstrated. And then, it begs all this really interesting question around like - you know - "What's Google going to do with it? And how much value is going to be created here?" So anyway, I thought it was a great story. And I just rambled on for a couple minutes, but I - I - I don't know. It's pretty cool.

**Jason Calacanis**
No. No. Super interesting. Is - is this AI capable of making a Science Corner that David Sacks pays attention to?

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Well, it will -

**Jason Calacanis**
Is it possible?

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
It will predict the cure, I think, for the common cold and for herpes, so he should pay attention.

**Jason Calacanis**
Absolutely. Folding Cells is the app that Sacks -

**David Friedberg**
By the way, I'll - I'll get - I'll

**Jason Calacanis**
- casual game - Sacks just downloaded - is playing. How many -

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
They - no but - no - no -

**Jason Calacanis**
How many chess moves did you make during that segment, Sacks?

**David Friedberg**
Let - let - let - sorry, let me just say one more thing. Do you guys remember we talked about Yamanaka factors -

**Jason Calacanis**
Yes.

**David Friedberg**
- and how challenging it is to - basically, we can reverse aging if we can get the right proteins into cells to tune the expression of certain genes to make those cells youthful. Right now, it's a shotgun approach to trying millions of compounds and combinations of compounds to do that. There's a lot of companies actually trying to do this right now to come up with a fountain-of-youth-type product. We can now simulate that. So with this system, one of the things that this AlphaFold 3 can do is predict what molecules will bind and promote certain sequences of DNA, which is exactly what we try and do with the Yamanaka-factor-based expression systems, and find ones that won't trigger off-target expression. So, meaning we can now go through the search space in software of creating a combination of molecules that, theoretically, could unlock this fountain of youth - to de-age all the cells in the body and introduce an extraordinary kind of health benefit. And that's just, again, one example of the many things that are possible -

**Jason Calacanis**
Incredible.

**David Friedberg**
- with this sort of platform. I - I - and I'm really - I got to be honest. I'm really just sort of skinning the surface here of what this can do. The - the capabilities and the impact are going to be like - I don't know - I know I say this sort of stuff a lot, but it's going to be pretty profound.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
There's a - on the blog post, they have this incredible video that they show of the coronavirus that creates a common cold. I think it - the 7PNM protein. And not only did they literally like predict it accurately, they also predicted how it interacts with an antibody - with a sugar. It's nuts. So, you could see a world where like - I don't know - you just get a vaccine for the cold and it's kind of like you never have colds again.

**Jason Calacanis**
Amazing.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
I mean - simple stuff, but so powerful.

**David Friedberg**
And you can filter out stuff that has off-target effects. So, so much of drug discovery and all the side effect stuff can start to be solved for in silicone.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Yeah.

**David Friedberg**
And you could think about running extraordinarily large - use a model like this run - extraordinarily large simulations in a search space of chemistry to find stuff that does things in the body - that can unlock - you know - all these benefits - can do all sorts of amazing things to destroy cancer, to destroy viruses, to repair cells, to de-age cells. All these -

**Jason Calacanis**
And this is a $100 billion business they say. For - for Google could be huge. Yeah.

**David Friedberg**
Oh, my God, I mean - this alone. I - I feel like - this is where I - I've said this before. I think Google's got this like portfolio of like quiet - you know -

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah, the other bets.

**David Friedberg**
- extraordinarily high bets. Yeah. Yeah, this one -

**Jason Calacanis**
What if they hit? Yeah, what if they - what if they hit?

**David Friedberg**
And the fact - and I think the fact that they didn't open-source everything in this says a lot -

**Jason Calacanis**
Says something.

**David Friedberg**
- about their intentions. Yeah.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah, open-source when you're behind. Close-source / lock it up when you're ahead.

**David Friedberg**
But showed it off -

**Jason Calacanis**
The Yamanaka, actually -

**David Friedberg**
Yeah, that. Yeah.

**Jason Calacanis**
Interestingly, Yamanaka is the Japanese whiskey that Sacks serves on his plain as well. It's delicious. I love that Hokkaido Yakanama whiskey. Remember we had that?

**David Friedberg**
Jason, I feel like if - if - if you didn't find your way to Silicon Valley, you could be like a Vegas lounge comedy guy. Like you know -

**Jason Calacanis**
Absolutely. For sure.

**David Friedberg**
Yeah. Yeah.

**Jason Calacanis**
I was actually - yeah. Somebody said I should do -

**David Friedberg**
Like - like 1950s - those 1950s talk shows where the guys would do like the - the - stage show.

**Jason Calacanis**
The schtick. Yeah, yeah. No, somebody told me I should do like Spalding Gray / Eric Bogosian style stuff. I don't know if you guys remember like the - the monologue is from the '80s in New York. I was like, "Oh, that's interesting. Maybe." Alright, everybody. Thanks for tuning in to the world's #1 podcast. Can you believe we did it, Chamath? The #1 world podcast in the world. And the All-In Summit - the TED killer. If you are going to TED, congratulations for genuflecting. If you want to talk about real issues, come to the All-In Summit. And if you're protesting at the All-In Summit, let us know what mock meat you would like to have. Friedberg is setting up mock meat stations for all of our protesters. And what milk you would like -

**David Sacks**
Vegan food.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yeah, all vegan. If you want - if you're oat milk - soy / nut milk -

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
And your preference of nut milk.

**Jason Calacanis**
Just please. When you come to protest -

**David Friedberg**
We have five different kinds of xanthan gum you can choose from. Right, Chamath?

**Jason Calacanis**
We have all of the nut milks you could want and then they'll be mindfull yoga with goats.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Soy lecithin. Can we have some soy lecithin, please?

**Jason Calacanis**
Yes. On the south lawn, we'll have the goat yoga going on. So, just please. Look back. The goat yoga will be going on the front lawn.

**David Sacks**
It's very thoughtful for you to make sure that our protesters are going to be well - well fed - well taken care of.

**Jason Calacanis**
Yes, we're actually - Friedberg is working on the protestor gift bags - the protestor gift bags. They're - they're - they're made of Yakanama folding proteins, so you're good.

**David Friedberg**
Yakanama. Hahaha.

**Jason Calacanis**
The Folding Proteins - I think I saw them open for The Smashing Pumpkins in 2003.

**David Friedberg**
That's so good. On fire.

**Jason Calacanis**
Alright, enough.

**David Friedberg**
On fire.

**Jason Calacanis**
Enough. I'll be here for three more nights.

**Chamath Palihapitiya**
Love you boys. Bye bye.

**Jason Calacanis**
Love you besties.

**David Sacks**
Is this the All-In Pod or open-mic night? What's going on?

**Jason Calacanis**
It's basically - I'm just bored.

[ Outro Music ]

**Jason Calacanis**
Alright, that's episode 178. And now, the plugs. The All-In Summit is taking place in Los Angeles on September 8th through the 10th. You can apply for a ticket at summit.allinpodcast.co. Scholarships will be coming soon. If you want to see the four of us interview Sam Altman, you can actually see the video of this podcast on YouTube - youtube.com/@allin - or just search "All-In Podcast". And hit the alert bell and you'll get

updates when we post. We're doing a Q&A episode live when the YouTube channel hits 500,000. And we're going to do a party in Vegas - my understanding - when we hit a million subscribers. So, look for that as well. You can follow us on X - x.com/theallinpod. TikTok is @all_in_tok. Instagram - @theallinpod. And on LinkedIn, just search for the "All-In Podcast". You can follow Chamath at x.com/chamath. And you can sign up for his Substack at chamath.substack.com. I do. Friedberg can be followed at x.com/friedberg. And Ohalo is hiring. Click on the 'Careers' page at ohalogenetics.com. And you can follow Sacks at x.com/davidsacks. Sacks recently spoke at the American Moment conference and people are going crazy for it. It's pinned to his tweet on his X profile. I'm Jason Calacanis. I am x.com/jason. And if you want to see pictures of my bulldogs and the food I'm eating, go to instagram.com/jason - in the first name club. You can listen to my other podcast, This Week in Startups. Just search for it on YouTube or your favorite podcast player. We are hiring a researcher. Apply to be a researcher doing primary research and working with me and producer Nick. Working in data, and science, and being able to do great research, finance, etc. - allinpodcast.com/research. It's a full-time job working with us - the besties. We'll see you all next time in the All-In Podcast.