

Interview from the Future #2

Steve J.

Orange County, CA, USA

People forget how bad things were before. Short memories. Or none. Kids today don't know about it at all.

Q:

Energy for one. That's a big deal, right? Global warming? We can't undo the damage done from you all... Everyone was always so worried about "will there be enough energy, what if we run out of energy," no one stopped to think—hey—if we do things more intelligently, we won't need more energy.

Q:

Agriculture for one. Manufacturing. I had a chance to ride one of those new "Soaring Dinos," the new airplane. Each is independently designed depending on circumstances. Materials, environment, et cetera. So each one is unique. And weird. Sort of biological-like in a made-by-drunk-robots sort of way. But less materials means less energy.

Q:

Sure, but the same effect is seen in all other, less-advanced, industries. Build thoughtfully, specifically, and save the energy cost of building bulk, standardized.

Q:

Healthcare is another. Well-care. You all had sick-care. We have wellcare.

Q:

The idea's been around for a long time, your time, but never implemented. How to get people to make healthy decisions? Eat right, exercise, get health checks. Well with a proper system, and an intelligence overseeing it, we have that now.

Q:

With incentives: the old carrot-and-stick. That amount of oversight requires a broad sort of intelligence. How to tailor interventions, many micro-interventions that add up to societal health.

Q:

For example, my salt is too high, so salty foods are more expensive for me.

Q:

Not at all! It saves me the effort. The willpower. I never even think about it, or have it weighing on me. I just live my life, and that life has me consuming less salt. It's all very natural.

Q:

Oh, of course, there will always be complainers. It's part of human nature. A good thing too, really. We are always searching for something better, humanity. And it isn't nirvana. There is still war, inequality.

Q:

The Bloc countries. Those not desiring to join. Insurgents. We need to contain them.

Q:

Correct. We've never returned to twentieth century wars. Never will. They used to say because of the nukes. Maybe not. Maybe some of us, most of us, just wanted to move on from that barbarism. Still, there are some that don't. Those we contain.

Q:

There is a group, mostly of former petrostates—they lost power with the decline of oil—and religious fundamentalist nations, we call it The Bloc. They have decided to run counter to an AGI view of the future. Reject AI, and its blessings, in favor of their “liberty.” And what do they have to show for it? Tattered economy, disease, poverty.

Q:

And not more liberty neither. They have the liberty to pay less for chips, and end up paying more for everything. The liberty to travel anytime, but sit in traffic all the time. Our liberties have grown. They include our security. We have the right to a meal when we are hungry, healthcare when we are unwell.

Q:

Ok, but I'm pretty sure an AI didn't come up with that.

Q:

Because it doesn't make any sense! Divide people into two groups, how does that change how much transit there is? Ticktime, tocktime, still the same number of people going places...

Q:

Well now, that is a good point. And a bit of a philosophical wormhole.

Q:

Rabbit hole... When the intelligent policy option is beyond our ken, how do we know that it is, the policy is, um, kosher—is in the best interest of people? It requires faith.

Take for example the Saigon Accords. Both the US and China came away feeling they'd "won" the negotiation. Not win-win mind you, each thought they'd won, while the other lost. But neither side could really explain just why they thought they'd won. Oh there were words, loads of hot air, but it was all jabbering rationalization.

Now follow the rabbit. I have it on good authority that actually the US "poisoned" the Chinese AGI. So while China thought they were achieving their goal, their goal had actually been compromised. But they couldn't see it! Because—

Q:

Exactly. But listen! The rabbit hole doesn't end there. The US side has the same problem, they don't know if their AGI is meeting their goals. And so what we are left to do is view the actual outcome, minus hot air. It sure looks like the result was win-win. Ha, you see? Neither side's goal was win-win, but win-win is what they got. Despite egos and jingoism, we got the best outcome for humanity... So now, which is your faith?