1	Α	Combinatorics	Approach	to Pattern	Recognition	of
			1 1			

Bitarray Datastreams

Theo Portlock

December 17, 2023

. Abstract

In our lives, we try to make decisions that increase the possibility of moral outcomes. We judge others by their moral objectives and their adherance to them. Identifying, understanding, and mitigating the flaws of human thought process and decision making is essential for human progress.

Despite much progress made in the field of artificial intelligence, a tool that makes better, more informed moral decisions than a human has not been developed and is the aim of this study. A novel approach that involves the field of combinatorics to bitarray datastreams with a likeness to the neuronal communication in the brain was developed to achieve these ends. The possibility of succeeding is incalcuable but increases with effort, time, and expertise. However, if good progress towards these aims are made, the consequences will pave the way for the future of a more moral society.

₁₆ Contents

17	Abstract	iii
18	Table of Contents	v
19	List of Figures	ix
20	List of Tables	xi
21	1 Introduction	1
22	1.1 Morality	1
23	1.1.1 Moral origins	1
24	1.1.2 Moral relationships - Interaction between two moral systems	2
25	1.1.3 Moral consensus - Majority moral opinion	2
26	1.1.4 Moral evolution - How morality changes over time	2
27	1.2 The state of current majority moral opinion	3
28	1.2.1 How is society improving?	3
29	1.2.2 How is society deteriorating?	3

	COMPENIE
V1	CONTENTS

30		1.3	Fallibilities and limitations of human decision making	3
31			1.3.1 Bias and Discrimination, Misinformation, and Information deficit	3
32			1.3.2 The scale of human computation	3
33		1.4	Alternative decision making algorithms	4
34			1.4.1 Deep learning	4
35			1.4.2 HTM	4
36			1.4.3 How to align intelligent systems with consensus moral beliefs	4
37		1.5	AI safety and responsibility	4
38		1.6	Project aims	4
39	2	Inpi	ıt	5
39	2	Inpi	ıt	5
39 40	2	Inp (2.1	Sources of data	5
	2	-		
40	2	2.1	Sources of data	5
40 41	2	2.1	Sources of data	5
40 41 42	3	2.1 2.2 2.3	Sources of data	5 5
40 41 42 43		2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4	Sources of data	5 5 5
40 41 42 43		2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4	Sources of data	5 5 5
40 41 42 43		2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4	Sources of data	5 5 7

9

48 4 Memory

	CC	ONTE	NTS	vii
49		4.1	Classical combinatorics	10
50		4.2	The combination problem of scale	10
51		4.3	Slicing the combinations array	10
52			4.3.1 Combinations of combinations	10
53		4.4	Storage	10
54		4.5	Prediction	10
55		4.6	Persistance of activation	10
56		4.7	Edge contraction	10
57		4.8	Delay function	10
58		4.9	Transfer and Storage	10
59		4.10	Memory merging	10
60	5	Run	time	11
61		5.1	Chapter introduction	11
62	6	Test	ing	13
63		6.1	Chapter introduction	13
64		6.2	Test 1 - Parrot	14
65		6.3	Test 2 - Mathematics	14
66			6.3.1 True/False	14
67			6.3.2 Addition	14
68			6.3.3 Sine prediction	14

viii	CONTENTS

69		6.3.4 Modelling and the stock market	4
70	6.4	Test 3 - Natural language modelling	4
71		6.4.1 Text prediction	4
72	6.5	Test 4 - Sound signal processing	4
73		6.5.1 Voice recognition	4
74	6.6	Test 5 - Image classification	4
75		6.6.1 Breast cancer tissue classification	4

$_{76}$ List of Figures

x LIST OF FIGURES

7 List of Tables

xii LIST OF TABLES

⁷⁸ Chapter 1

₇₉ Introduction

80 1.1 Morality

- 81 Morality is the principles that define right and wrong actions. A moral agent acts according to a
- ₈₂ moral system. Those moral systems can contain moral subsytems that they may chose or not. In
- 83 a moral system, an event is considered morally good if its consequences increase the probability
- of a moral end.

85 1.1.1 Moral origins

- 86 Moral systems can be descibed as natural or non-natural in origin. Natural morals are those that
- 87 are installed without observation. A proportion of all moral agents will act randomly. Actions
- that are observed implies that those actions did not result in the death of the other individual.
- ⁸⁹ This filter ensures that random actions that result in death are not observed and are therefore not
- continued. Non-natural morals are those that are installed from observation.

1.1.2 Moral relationships - Interaction between two moral systems

Moral ends vary between individuals. The morality of others and their moral compatibility can be
only be predicted from a record of past actions. When individual moral agents interact, one of three
possible interactions can be observed. Firstly, a Rejective interaction manifests as an assumption
that each other's actions are bad (-/-). Secondly, an Assymetric interaction is a consequence of
the willingness of only one moral agent to encourage the others pursuit of their respective moral
systemi (+/-). Lastly, an Acceptive interaction is the understanding that the ends described by
a moral system converges to the point that their continued actions weighted by their estimated
probability is similar to those actions taken by the moral system of another individual (+/+).

1.1.3 Moral consensus - Majority moral opinion

An estimation of common "good" is essential for collective progress. The search for this consensus 101 is done at a personal or a collective level when we vote, poll, or protest. An estimation of common 102 "good" is also necessary for collective arbitration of an action; a field referred to as descriptive 103 or comparative ethics. Once a consensus is established, the application of the golden rule, the 104 principle of treating others as you wish to be treated, forms the basic principles of justice and social contract. Communication of intention can often be reciprocal, that is to say one individual has and 106 understanding of the others understanding of your understanding (and so on). An understanding 107 of the consequences of breaking this rule encourages the enforcement of a social contract. The 108 lesser the amount of knowledge surrounding subject matter, the greater the room for reasonable 109 disagreement. Factual consensus has no claim to moral authority. 110

1.1.4 Moral evolution - How morality changes over time

Consensus morality changes over time. Although opinions of an action can be changed by a greater understanding of probabilities of consequences that arise after the action, morals are unaffected by facts. Moral re-evaluation is also possible through the revelation of inconsistencies. The cause of this can be due to incomplete data relating to a moral question or cognitive dissonance.

1.2 The state of current majority moral opinion

Although the secularisation of western countries and adoption of enlightenment ideals is often considered a loss of moral congruency, the opposite is most likely as a consequence of interreligious moral alignment. Based on polling data, core moral principles include:

$_{120}$ 1.2.1 How is society improving?

With respect to the current moral consensus, there has been significant moral progress ¹.

1.2.2 How is society deteriorating?

23 1.3 Fallibilities and limitations of human decision making

In all humans there is a preinstalled moral operating system referred to as natural morality. This
system has evolved to promote reproduction and survival. Consensus morality today is different
from natural morality In order to supress these naturalistic urges and reverse these forms of societal
deterioration, it is important to look at the origins. The pursuit of overcoming these urges is one
which we should all share².

29 1.3.1 Bias and Discrimination, Misinformation, and Information deficit

1.3.2 The scale of human computation

With the advancements in electronic data storage, the availability of data brings with it the potential for more accurate predictive tools than any point previously. However, the current restraints of human computational load limits the rate at which these tools can be utilised.

1.4 Alternative decision making algorithms

Computation makes decisions Currently, there has been no success in the construction of an artificial moral agent that mitigates the real issues in human moral decision making process.

1.4.1 Deep learning

1.4.2 HTM

Numenta³, alpha go, etc

1.4.3 How to align intelligent systems with consensus moral beliefs

As with humans, if an agent has greater intelligence then there is a greater importance that the agent has a moral system that aligns with the core values that supports the current majority moral opinion. Transparency of decision making process is cruicial for the public arbitration of artificial decision making algorithms;

$_{\scriptscriptstyle{145}}$ 1.5 AI safety and responsibility

46 1.6 Project aims

Current attempts have fallen short at achieving these ends and resulted in hyperspecific reward seeking behaviour. The aim of this study is to leverage the advancements of computing to create a system that will make more moral choices than those made by a human. Separate from traditional neural network architectures, Hirachical Temporal Memory (HTM) is a technique developed by Numenta that more closely resembles the connections between axons in the brain. In this study, the guiding principles of HTM combined with a novel system for self-validation will be designed to evaluate *ab initio* learning of a new machine learning model. Python will be used principally for development, testing, and validation.

¹⁵⁵ Chapter 2

Input

- ¹⁵⁷ 2.1 Sources of data
- ¹⁵⁸ 2.2 Binary conversion
- 2.3 Sparcity
- 160 2.4 Tandem data input

Chapter 3

Output

3.1 How are decisions made

Decision field theory is a method of mathematically modelling the change in utility when comparing multiple choices ⁴. Currently, machines do not act this way.

166 3.2 The random-pianist method

3.3 The Upgrade workflow

- No delayed combinations only reinforce if you see it muliple times I = input that does not result
- $_{169}$ from an action A = input that results from an action R = random input (or choice of previous
- set: pseudorandom) [] = combination expansion Both the action and the actions effects should be
- 171 recognised by combinations
- 172 II, R1 –; A1[II, R1] I2, A1, R2 –; A2[I2, A1, R2] I3, A2, R3 –; A3[I3, A2, R3] I4, A3, R4 –;
 173 A4[I4, A3, R4]
- Aims: 1: Learn actions from inputs 2: Decrease entropy from the UEI 3: Learn inputs from inputs

Whats being combined for each timepoint: Random doping I1, R1 I2, R2, A1[I1, R1] I3, R3,

176 A2[I2, R2, A1[I1, R1]] ...

8

- actions included I1, A1 I2, A1(I1) I3, A2(I2), A2(A1(I1)), A2(I2 + A1(T1))
- 178 W/O random doping I1 I2, A1[I1] I3, A2[I2, A1[I1]] ...
- $\ \, \text{expanded W/O random doping I1 I2, A1(I1) I3, A2(I2), A2(A1(I1)), A2(I2+A1(T1)) \dots } \\$
- translated: new input the action resulting from the second input the action resulting from the
- action resulting from the first input the action resulting from a combination of the second input
- $_{182}$ $\,$ and the action resulting from the first input
- 183 R1, I1, A1

¹⁸⁴ Chapter 4

$_{185}$ Memory

- 4.1 Classical combinatorics
- ¹⁸⁷ 4.2 The combination problem of scale
- ¹⁸⁸ 4.3 Slicing the combinations array
- 4.3.1 Combinations of combinations
- 190 4.4 Storage
- ¹⁹¹ 4.5 Prediction
- 4.6 Persistance of activation
- 193 4.7 Edge contraction
- 194 4.8 Delay function

Chapter 5

Runtime

5.1 Chapter introduction

$_{200}$ Chapter 6

$_{201}$ Testing

6.1 Chapter introduction

- 203 This chapter will focus on some of the more well known problems that face current machine
- ²⁰⁴ learning models. As opposed to traditional testing nomenclature in software design (unit testing,
- integration testing), I will refer to all forms of experimentation as testing (such as Turing testing).

- 206 **6.2** Test 1 Parrot
- 207 6.3 Test 2 Mathematics
- 208 6.3.1 True/False
- 209 **6.3.2** Addition
- 210 6.3.3 Sine prediction
- 211 6.3.4 Modelling and the stock market
- 212 6.4 Test 3 Natural language modelling
- 213 6.4.1 Text prediction
- 214 6.5 Test 4 Sound signal processing
- 215 6.5.1 Voice recognition
- 216 6.6 Test 5 Image classification
- 217 6.6.1 Breast cancer tissue classification

Bibliography

- 219 [1] Steven Pinker. The better angels of our nature: The decline of violence in history and its
 220 causes. Penguin uk, 2011.
- 221 [2] Friedrich Nietzsche. The will to power. Vintage, 1968.
- 222 [3] Numenta HTM Numenta. Home page, numenta inc, 2007.
- [4] Jerome R Busemeyer and Adele Diederich. Survey of decision field theory. Mathematical Social
 Sciences, 43(3):345–370, 2002.