

## **Chapter 3 Communism and Democracy**

Here comes the exciting part, communism and democracy. I am listing both of them because I think both of them have a significant chance of being the society that we live in in the distant future. In this chapter, I will analyze how each system works and how they are supposed to be effective in connection with the aims we discussed previously. I will also talk about how they are carried out in the past and present, and try to make some sense of history. Eventually, I will touch on the subject about how to make them work, because I think both of them are reasonable systems.

I may not be proceeding in that exact order. Also, there could be other concepts we need to insert in order to reason better. This chapter is a challenge, but it's definitely one worth having.

### **3.1 Meaning of C and D**

I see Communism and Democracy as two extremes of a power spectrum determined by how concentrated the power is. Communism is when the power is extremely concentrated, that is, all decisions are made by one. Democracy is when the power is extremely diluted, that is, all decisions are made by all.

I have to put this into a section because I want to make it clear that what I mean by Communism is not what Karl Marx meant by it, and by extension, all the political systems that intended to realize Marx's vision. Marx's communism is actually a form of utopia, in which there is no government or oppression. Humans are no

longer enslaved by their biological needs as factories can efficiently produce all that's needed for all humans. Humans can do what they desire and the society will flourish, stress-free. That's all very beautiful, but the fatal flaw in this blueprint for me is that humans are still productive in this stress-free status. Just contemplate this question: if you do not have a mortgage to pay, groceries to buy, kids to raise and retirement to pay, will you come to work today? Or any work, ever? And how do you think other people will respond to that question?

I think this is a question that deserves attention. I have asked myself, and my answer is yes. Probably not productive as Marx means (contributing to the progress of human society), but I cannot live with myself if what motivates me everyday is lunch. I have asked other people, and many gave me no answers. They said they would rather stay at home all day, sleeping, eating or just play with their phone, rather than going to any form of work. And I have no doubt that Marx himself will give a yes answer as well, seeing how he thinks this is so natural that he didn't even bother to think of any form of incentive in his utopia. I am not sure if the yes and no people are different by experience, that is, can be corrected when they have had enough rest, or by nature, that is, there's something biochemically different between the two groups. Of course, picturing a situation that you have not even the distant knowledge of, and is forced to make a choice, then it is safe to question the reliability of the choice and the authenticity of the answer. But this is indeed a profound question that touches on human nature, and should worry Marx and everyone who dreams of a utopia of similar form.

Here is the definition of Communism and Democracy.

- Communism

- Aim: the happiness of the community / Darwinian success of the species
- Power Holder: one entity
- Democracy
  - Aim: the will of the majority / the will of the community
  - Power Holder: all members of the community

Democracy by my definition has been tried out many times in real life.

Communism by my definition has been as well. We shall discuss Communism first, because it is easier.

### **3.2 Communism**

Soviet and China both attempted Communism some while ago. But they were both not the communism fantasized by Marx because, first, there is a government, second, no one is beyond the struggle of basic needs. That makes these attempts a little comic, but still worth discussing.

Coming back to my definition of Communism, the aim is completely off. The power holder part came close, but the power was not absolute enough nor the enforcement. There were protests and revolutions, none of that shall happen in my definition of Communism. I did not put a utopia component in either of these two definitions even though I will be applying them to the future. I believe that utopia in the sense that all biological necessities are fulfilled can be accomplished in one way (boost production power and efficiency) or another (control world population or just have some wars). However, a utopia in which all needs are fulfilled is impossible because that's antihuman.

Now let's jump into the future and see some concepts that may be realized in

the future.

### **[AI Manager]**

The idea is simple. It will be a machine manager that manages human society. Life will not be run by an individual, or a collective, or words that are open to interpretation, but by codes. Clear logical commands that cannot be interpreted, but only executed. Surely commands are written by humans as well. But the question is not written by who, but written for what. And once the society settles on one of the eight aims, or decides what mix of aims by what proportion, it ought not be difficult to decide how to achieve those aims. That's where AI comes in. I did not choose AI simply because it is the most valued technology today and it never ceases to amaze, but also because AI will learn to solve problems themselves and program itself. The better the AI is, the less we need to worry about how to achieve the aims. But we still need to know how to build such an AI. But that's a scientific question, not a socio-political one, which is much easier to answer.

I can probably write this section better when I start to dip my toes in machine learning.

### **[Matrix]**

Here we look back on the pleasure principle.

I think as science unravels more and more what was supposed to be mysteries, our ability to lie to ourselves. Suicide is now a major "health issue". More and more people are asking what is the meaning of life in an alarming frequency, and they are not philosophers. I believe that just like happiness, giving life meaning is another function of the brain. If a brain is doing its job well, we do not need to ask existential questions, but there are not any. If a brain is doing a tremendously good job, some would not

even understand those existential questions. It would utter nonsense to them. Like I cannot understand why some are terrified of spiders.

This meaning mechanism, just the pleasure mechanism, is just another gift of evolution. When it's working fine, we will do stuff that helps our survival and we will be happy doing it, feeling fulfilled. We will recognize that not as "good for survival", but "the very meaning of life". And now this system goes wrong now and then, that's inevitable. There are people who suicide because their pleasure system is broken, and there are people who drift around because their meaning system is malfunctioning. The saddest is when they try to find the meaning of life by reading existentialism and go into philosophy, then leave in disappointment. Well, philosophy is not going to fix anyone's meaning system, if anything, it makes it worse. It makes questioning the meaning of life easy, popular and superior.

In the past, if you questioned the meaning of life, people would laugh at you. In recent times, people send you to an asylum. Today, people look at you like you are on the way to becoming a great philosopher. Sometimes, you do. But more often than not, you become depressed and become a problem for the society, while taking pride and pleasure from it the entire time. The most poisonous pleasure in the world is self-pity. "Geniuses are lonely." "Brilliance comes with pain." "Existentialists suicide". That is terrible.

But that's the extreme of how harmful science and philosophy can be to fuel the collapse of our meaning system. I believe this will only become more prevalent and severe as time goes on and knowledge accumulates, and more and more devote their lives to science and philosophy.

So one quick solution to the meaning system broken by science and philosophy is

virtual reality. So real and virtual that you won't even know you are it. It is kind of like the Matrix. But this time is honestly done for our own good. Done to accommodate our out-of-date Darwinian survival strategies whose last functional time was a million years ago in Serengeti.

We are probably already in it. Then there is truly nothing to complain about. Every piece of pain, awkwardness, sadness, disappointment and loss was designed to be there. We are at the natural limit now. Nothing to blame except the law of existence itself.

### **[Post-Darwinian Reward System]**

If you are like me, then you hate the idea of limits, especially Darwinian limits. We are advanced intellectuals! Why should we still be bound by the same rules as the cavemen? We did not go through religion war, race war, nuclear weapons, enlightenment, industrialization, communism and democracy, CRISPR and string theory, just to stand in front of our own body, our own gene pool, holding the right equipment, armed with all the tech, and shake our heads and surrender our fate to nature.

Come on! Let us transcend evolution and pleasure principle, and build our own biology! Isn't that the meaning of science? Isn't that the point of being human? I hope you are convinced, and are ready to take on a journey with me to see our new feature. I doubt whatever new human we ended up building is still human. If we revise the pleasure principle, the meaning system, the way we process information, have sensory input, make decisions and store memory, we are editing human nature. Personally, I just want a little less coercion from basic needs. I want the memory storage to be a little larger, less distorted and a better access. I want the information process to be a little more logical and well-structured, and a little less being easily

hijacked by emotion. I also want to be able to close the auditory system whenever I want. I also want total control of my sleep-awake cycle. Hate insomnia pills and alarm clocks. I will make no guesses, comments or instructions on this new “human”, because that hits my maximum intellectual ability. So many possibilities. And for failing as well. The last thing I want to see is that any positive changes (as we perceive it) of our human nature will result in the demise of the species. It is possible that this, indeed, is the best possible world.

I don't know if these concepts excite you or terrify you. But I believe that this is certainly a version of our future. The futurists' utopia. Communism does not need much revision to achieve its goal because AI is not like us. And either this is an Absolute Dominance or there's simply no incentive for revolution, this power system, once implemented, is unshakable from the inside.

There is always a chance that some malfunction could occur, or alien attack, or the sun ages, something like that. Either we have a good AI, or instincts kick in and we have the incentive to do something, or we perish.

### **3.3 Democracy**

The heart of democracy is the wisdom of the collective. That's the fatal flaw of the system because people are ignorant and misguided. The system is a failure from the start, let alone the political parties, court quibbles and other farsade.

#### **3.3.1 Ignorant Thesis**

The thesis is: As society makes progress (in the enlightenment sense), each individual member of society will be more and more ignorant, caused either by

the

contrast of the growing collective knowledge, or the increasing specialization feature that is inherent to human society.

I kind of sacrificed clarity for simplicity so I will explain some more. The thesis's name has only one word, "ignorant", here referring to members of society. Why? Two reasons. One is that the human mind has limited ability for learning in a fixed time scale with a growing amount of knowledge. Today, a qualified science researcher needs to spend almost 20 years of their life in school. And even a physicist is not really a physicist, he is more likely to be an expert of a special branch of physics, or even an expert of a special topic in a special branch of topic. Three people walk into a colloquium, an undergrad, a Ph.D student and a professor. And they take home different things from the presentation, and none of them understood all of the presentation. As physics advances, the time it takes to train a physicist is still about 20 years, but that does not mean our training is getting better, nor does it mean that our physics students are getting smarter; in fact, the quality of knowledge processed by today's physicists is leaps and bounds ahead of the past, but the amount of knowledge, is the same (within a century), but the ratio of individual knowledge to collective knowledge plummeted. That is what's really happening. Viewing from a macroscopic perspective, it just looks like the physicist, our intellectuals, and ourselves are getting ignorant. And that's inevitable because what is blocking us here is biological.

Another reason is specialization. Each individual in society fills in a different niche, and that's what society expects from us, because in that way, we are more stable (we are survival obligated to stick together) and efficient (if a physicist needs to learn how to make his own pants, he would need a lot more than just 20 years). We are getting



ignorant, and that's exactly what society wants from us. Just focus on our small corner of expatriates, and the society will promise you a good living. What is blocking us here is our evolutionary identity of social animals.

Here you can ask if knowledge can be quantified. I think that's a hard question and I think I can make this argument work without addressing that question. We should instead ask, why should we quantify knowledge? What I am doing here is quantifying the effect of knowledge, because knowledge in the sense of knowing not just your branch of physics, but also the entire physics, and how to make pants, etc., are the knowledge that democracy expects from us. Democracy expects us to know everything that we need to take into account when we make political decisions. Tell me if making pants and knowing physics are not equally important in that context. That's the loophole of Athen's legacy. I bet Socrates knows more about making pants than most of us.

### **3.3.2 Sophisticated Democracy**

So now I presented the loophole of Athenian democracy, can we get around it? Probably, with some engineering. If we insist on having democracy (I honestly think it is too much work in a utopia, better let the computer run things for us), maybe we can plant chips in our head, or get brain tissue implants, or do some gene editing. I think there is a way of getting around this loophole, but I doubt it is worth so much trouble. This fascination over democracy is absurd. Every claim needs to be pondered. Are we pursuing democracy for democracy's sake? What is so good about democracy? Is it still worth the trouble when we see the glaring loopholes and terrible performance of the system?

If one can truly convince oneself that democracy is worthy, then please put

together a proposal that demonstrates good thinking and loyal perseverance. A sophisticated democracy, or any political system is better off without capitalism. But seeing our current capacity, capitalism is our best solution to society's needs. And in this perspective, we have gone too far from the cavemen—still bound by our biological needs as countless fellow human beings are still struggling with starvation and fighting for mere survival.

Another way to get around the loophole is probably tied to the concept of shared consciousness, meaning that one day we can communicate in digital media. We can probably upload our brain to a computer, and we can communicate without misunderstandings, and individual knowledge would no longer exist, because at that time, there are no more individuals. We become one animal instead of a batch of social animals. Then by that time, probably no politics is needed. I am still highly suspicious about this uploading brain stuff. Using brainwaves to control external objects is already achieved. But translating brain waves into intelligible words sounds like a difficult task that could take centuries or a singularity. And snatching the mind (consciousness, emotions, knowledge and memory) from the brain sounds even more difficult. We are still unsure if the mind is even possible outside of the brain. Also, somatic sensory data might be indispensable for the mind. But doubts aside, it would be truly marvelous for democracy if this works.