

Second Philosophy

Led by	Marya Blaisdale / Maria Hume
Title	Humanity & Technology II
Date	24 August 2008

INTRODUCTION

Continuing on from last week's meeting we are focusing on the fact is that humanity as a species seems to simply be 'engineered' towards constant self improvement and thinking about how our views on what is moral have changed; our views on what is better have also changed – because the world around us has changed.

So how far will this go – will we forget what was once so important to us – that thing that defines us – our emotions.

Will we keep some and engineer out the less useful ones?

Will humans care when the time comes?

DISCUSSION:

Squish: I think the engineering can go many ways; we may engineer ourselves to have enhanced perceptions...in order to better appreciate music, for example. To enhance our experiences of things that makes life worthwhile to us

Wren: I think things that were once important were simply necessity

Shingles: it's pretty irrelevant but Im not sure emotions do define us

Sojourna: I've been thinking about our emotions - our ancestors did not have the range of emotions we have today.....

Marya: I don't think that's irrelevant Shingles - what do you think defines us?

Parrot: why cling so tightly to the perceived human condition?

Sojourna: The feeling of romantic love, for example, is only a few centuries old.

Marya: are we clinging to it though, Parrot?

Marya: Yes, Soj - exactly

Parrot: Absolutely.....we resist change

Wren: Sojourna, I agree

Shingles: I think our actions define us, Marya

Squish: oh there was some idea presented about possibly engineering the mind to feel romantic love for a life time

Dar: I'm not so sure I agree with that

Squish: to be devout

Parrot: socially, physically and mentally

Wren: the idea that certain things should define humanity is difficult because they were always change

Marya: well - when we talk about being 'humane' what are we talking about?

Alaya: I would come up with the idea that human were design in a certain way to fit certain circumstances

Squish: agreed - I don't think that certain things "should" define humanity

Squish: humanity is what it is...and, according to Nietzsche, it's in constant flux :)

Parrot: the animal we are at present which may become something else

Marya: agree with that, Squish :)

Shingles: what about our actions defining us, Squish

Dar: The Odyssey and the Iliad make little sense in several parts if you deny the characters romantic love

Second Philosophy

Wren: Marya, I think we're talking about the affect we have on others, not just ourselves, being aware of it and acting accordingly

Squish: shingles, I think our actions reflect us

Squish: I'm hesitant to use the word "define"

Shingles: that seems reasonable, squish

Marya: I have heard it said that we do everything we do because of emotion - do you think this is true or not?

Alaya: magik this is why I used design

Wren: it would depend on what exactly emotion is

Marya: any and all emotions

Squish: Marya, I think that could use some probing

Wren: if desire is, then yes, everything is emotion; even just desire to fit in

Squish: intuitively, it sounds a bit too general

Dar: No, Marya, I do not think all we do is determined by emotion

Shingles: it could be argued to be true, but I don't think they do, Marya

Parrot: heartbeat.....not emotion driven

Pun: That's a bit exaggerated, but psychology claims that emotions have a key role in our motivation.

Sage: I think the question shouldn't be about "what defines us" that we must hold onto, but rather how we go about deciding what defines us.

Marya: good point Sage

Steve: wonder if Heidegger's definition of man's humanity will always hold true which is that our human why of being is to question what it means to be?

Marya: the point is - that we are emotional creatures - and, if you think about it, emotions can be seen to be a flaw - in that they are not perfect and they do on occasion mislead us

Alaya: in Asia they use the word sentient being, which mean feeling...

Squish: Emotions are also what make life worth living; we experience love, pleasure, happiness

Alaya: and feel in many ways...global, way, is to feel

Marya: Squish, do you think those things will always matter to humans?

Squish: if we were numb to everything, then we wouldn't care to live either

Squish: I do

Sojourna: That's interesting Squish - that emotions make life worth living....

Wren: I'm with you Squish

Squish: I think human beings will engineer themselves to enhance their pleasures in life

Sage: Marya, that isn't a flaw of emotions, but rather a flaw of the adaptation of the emotions to the situation.

Aristotle believed it was sometimes very good to get angry - anger was only a problem when it was not geared to the situation

Parrot: I don't think emotions define us as human.....someone created that category.....one that could communicate in writing

Marya: Indeed, Sage - makes sense

Shingles: they are useful for pleasure, and in checking our value-statements, but I think emotions are generally misleading

Marya: If you had the chance, any of you, to control your feelings - would you do it?

Shingles: I would

Squish: Emotions are not always aligned w/ reason - that's for sure. But I don't know if we should generalize them as "misleading"...misleading us from what?

Pun: Marya, I think they probably will matter, but there are, IMO, several courses humanity can take which would shut off emotions completely from the human mind. If someone, thousands of years from now, decides that we can replace emotions with something better, and has the means to do it (such means will probably be available then - genetic engineering or something similar), that will happen.

Sojourna: I would! My emotions are killing me!

Second Philosophy

Oswy: Marya I think that most humans have a rough and ready idea of what it is to be human eg a range of typical emotions or actions. Now we see that technology can enhance us in certain ways and this can be disturbing because it fouls up our categorization system.

Squish: if I could control my feelings, then I wouldn't necessarily do away with them. Rather, I would control them by enhancing the good ones :)

Sage: We do that all the time Marya... i don't understand the question... Our emotions are constantly getting kicked into line as our dispositions adapt imo

Shingles: from reason and/or intention, squish

Marya: That's what I've been wondering about Pun - whether we will or will not do it in time

Dar: as Martin Seligman points out in this TED Talk, equating emotions with happiness may not even be accurate: http://www.ted.com/index.php/talks/martin_seligman_on_the_state_of_psychology.html

Wren: I think it would be fantastic to be in complete control of your feelings

Chazz: I think emotions dominate our decisions far more than we can ever realize, but if you are going to say that every action is because of it, you first have to redefine emotion to mean every human decision, and are simply saying that $1 = 1$

Marya: What I mean, Sage, is if we are able to switch them on and off at will - love who we want to love, feel no anger when we need to be calm etc

Squish: Wren, I can understand that perspective. Yet I also do like having my buttons pushed from time to time - makes me feel alive :)

Wren: Marya, it would certainly make life a lot easier

Sage: Marya, it depends what you mean by 'will'; I mean to have a will you must have a desire to do something. It is a matter of resolving conflicts between emotions that I think you are addressing; choosing one or the other

Squish: hmm that's an interesting way of looking at it, Sage

Alaya: the feeling, were design as language to tell something , a sensor to guide yourself around if we control that, and it was manipulated enough , for awhile ,, we are getting in trouble and we are already i m sure

Oswy: Mayra I don't know the answer to whether all we do is because of emotions. It is a fact we have them do we want to get rid of some of them or not?

Marya: Yes - and being able to rationally apply emotions to the relevant situation :)

Shingles: would anyone say desires stem from emotions?

Squish: "rationally apply emotions"...lol there's a paradox

Marya: Yes, Oswy, if we had the power to get rid of some and keep others - would we do it

Squish: shingles - I also think desires may stem from emotions

Parrot: how's about getting rid of all emotions?

Sage: Marya, well I think that tends to happen naturally as we get older and trial and error shapes our dispositions, at least for some ;)

Squish: probably an intricate network more so than a serial path

Marya: Good question Parrot - what would motivate us without emotion, do you think?

Sojourna: I'm with Parrot - I would be quite glad to be rid of the lot of them.

Marya: For sure Sage

Squish: Parrot - I definitely wouldn't want to get rid of all emotions

Parrot: autonomic response

Wren: what would be the point of life if we had no emotion?

Wren: for that matter would we even be intelligent as we are now?

Sojourna: What is the point of life with emotions?

Shingles: the term desires can stem from emotions. But I think 'intention' is the rational counterpart to desire, Squish

Parrot: life as human?

Oswy: Marya, there is a thought experiment about the happiness machine a device of nano tech that could switch off bad feelings eg feelings of depression at will . Would that be a good idea if we could be happy whenever we felt like it? Don't we need some pain to be human?

Second Philosophy

Squish: even though they cause me to choose unwisely from time to time, I really couldn't endure life without them

Wren: if we could survive entirely without emotions, I think we would just be automatic robots

Alaya: its already been done, since many years and even more scientifically ,, studied ,,to manipulate and influence what we should see and feel in some situation, even in young children, don't cry, don't react this way... its bad,, ,,with religion,, and now more with media, a science

Parrot: human equated to having emotion as a definer

Squish: Oswy - I agree w/ you on pain

Pablooba: there is no point to life without emotions

Dar: You could look at drugs as a form of happiness machine

Squish: and agreed w/ Pablo too

Marya: Excellent point Oswy - I think we do in order to remain the sort of humans that we are now

Dar: and, drugs are pretty popular despite attempts to make them illegal

Steve: to be human is something you need to realize

Parrot: why remain in this form?

Sage: Well we wouldn't be alive if we didn't have emotions. I don't see how it even makes sense to discuss whether or not it would be 'better' since all our notions of 'better' come from our emotions. There wouldn't be any life to say what's better or not without emotions - just a list of ones and zeros that no one cares about.

Steve: not a given

Parrot: the future may require us to be otherwise

Marya: But, will we always 'feel' that way - think about how much our views have changed only in the last 500 years - will we still hold dear the things that matter to us today?

Shingles: No, one can be logical without emotion, sage

Oswy: Mayra this makes me think that we have a pretty clear idea of what it is that we expect to see in a human and we are nervous about changing that via enhancements?

Squish: Marya - we may change our feelings towards things, but I think we will always feel something

Wren: one can be logical, Shing, but can they be rational?

Shingles: and then qualify 'better' as 'more logical'

Sojourna: Sage - why does a value judgment like "betterness" comes from the emotions? Aren't value judgements rational ones?

Wren: there has to be an opposite... without emotion, we are not ever irrational

Steve: my question would be will we ever give up questioning?

Marya: Sage, I don't know if it is better as such - I want to explore what might happen - and what people think about that

Squish: I don't think it can be so simple as equating "logical" with "good" and "more logical" with "better"

Pun: Remember who makes most of the decisions for mankind. People with money and power. Perhaps an important question will be if they will want to create workers or consumers who have or don't have emotions, or who have or have not specific emotional responses.

Parrot: good point Steve as human or otherwise in our evolutionary process

Marya: I think so Oswy - there is a fear of change as Parrot mentioned

Wren: like I said Squish I think there's a diff between logic and rationality

Squish: oh yes Wren :) Definitely

Squish: sorry, I was replying to shingles

Dar: well Pun, I certainly disagree with the notion of engineering a subclass of humanity.

Sage: sojourna - rationality cannot be defined outside of emotional context

Steve: if to question makes us human

Wren: mmhmm and I was backing you up :D

Steve: to no longer question would mean to cease to be human

Marya: Scary thought Pun - but also a possibility for sure

Pun: I'm pretty sure I'm against engineering of human minds, too.

Second Philosophy

Shingles: hmm, I think we experience consequent emotions coinciding with our rationality, but we should endeavour not to let emotion interfere too much, Wren

Parrot: if defined that way...yes Steve

Squish: Wren, that makes me feel all fuzzy inside :) And that's the sort of thing that makes life bearable to me

Alaya: many people do experiments drugs, and behaviour pills, and they do get like more functional, but they are not getting more human, if they were lacking empathy, it wont give them back even if there is a choice to enhance the moral wit pills, or to stop anxiety either

Steve: this is why AI will never be human

Oswy: Pun why are you against such engineering?

Marya: Steve, I think I find that more frightening than anything - losing the interest in questioning

Pun: I guess it's because I value freedom.

Steve: yes Mayra

Wren: interest is emotion, again I say, without emotion, we would just be robots... zombies

Alaya: interests in feeling for....

Shingles: not to question is to be a machine

Wren: just existing, like mosquitoes, to survive and nothing more

Alaya: lol mosquitoes are fun

Dar: who said mosquitoes don't have emotion?

Wren: if they do they're horrible horrible beings

Dar: anyone here been a mosquito?

Pun: And if anything matters in the world (I'm not completely sure what it is, yet, though), those engineers of human souls might write their own vision over entire Earth, and disallow anyone to take a path different than theirs.

Shingles: I think our rationality would still be in us, wren

Sage: in any case, might i suggest this is a little off topic? I would argue that getting rid of emotions has never been on the table to begin with - that's not a place any amount of technology can go - I think we might consider some of the identity-problems that *can* be caused by technology though

Oswy: Pun what if you had the chance to eliminate certain feature of yourself eg less violence or less depression. Shouldn't people have that choice?

Parrot: yes and I told my kids when they asked why so much to stop whining

Alaya: its fast i can't read

Pun: Well, if it's a choice, I'm not against it.

Marya: Sage, you don't think getting rid of emotions would be considered at all? At least 'some' emotions?

Wren: would we have the choice to go back?

Sage: Marya, you can consider it all you want, but there's no way to do it lol =>

Marya: mmm, I think it is possible Sage

Pun: Especially if it's a completely informed choice.

Dar: I think some behavioural modifications, if voluntary, could be useful. Like getting rid of an unrequited love, or an unhealthy compulsion. Still, if voluntary.

Pablooba: I think technology slowly gives our emotions a back seat anyway

Shingles: medication already changes ones emotions, Marya, sage

Alaya: sage don't you know that they are cyber drugs waves to induce mind state and many other state online and this is technology, and before it was pills

Oswy: Pun the issue could then become one of a group who had agreed to enhancement say to sight or hearing and those who had not . Which group would then be the truly human?

Sage: Marya, of course we would be picking and choosing among our emotions - but to have any wish to do this, we would have to be motivated by other emotions.

Pablooba: but whether it will completely suppress them is another issue

Pun: Oswy, perhaps both of the groups will be equally human.

Marya: I understand that, Sage :)

Second Philosophy

Sojourna: Sage - technology might not aim to rid us of our emotions, but I can envision a future human being without them or with a different range of emotions, just like I know that our prehistoric ancestors had a vastly different range of emotions than what we do today.

Oswy: There is a distinct danger of fragmenting humanity via tech enhancement. Would that be a good thing?

Wren: I think we're already horribly fragmented

Squish: Soj - I agree there might be a shift in the human emotion spectrum

Squish: but still it will be there

Sage: a different range of emotions is certainly possible soj - but that's a very different topic

Shingles: there must be something other than emotions that motivates us, everybody

Pablooba: it's a fact that people have become desensitised to a lot of stuff that would have shocked (and probably still does shock) my mother and father - e.g. it invokes a stronger emotion. The more we are exposed to horrors the less sensitive we become to them

Pun: Oswy, I don't know, but aren't we getting too distant from the topic?

Alaya: they're is a danger to fragment the basis of our nature, brain think

Oswy: Wren don't we as I have said have a rough and ready idea of what we think humanness is?

Squeezy: Pablo, how about hangings and beheadings as form of entertainment?

Squish: Pablo - I think there are some horrors actually sensitize us to more horrors

Sage: shingles, well I kind of define emotion that way, shingles - you want to define it differently? Why?

Shingles: If all that motivated us was emotions, it would be completely fatalistic, and we would have an input-process-output life that would amount to nothing

Squeezy: I love Doom video game but wouldn't want to see those live

Alaya: Pab, yes we have been submitted to a lot of sensibilisation, and desensibilisation of all sort already

Sage: no shingles - emotions aren't definable in closed form in terms of physics

Steve: like to question one point in your opening remark Mayra

Oswy: Pun if the issue is technology and the threat to humanity I don't think we are. We have the prospect before us of huge impacts of technology on our skills and emotions and physical properties. eg we could enhance the length of our lives and all sorts of things . Do we leave these to individual choice or do we control them and on what basis?

Pun: Shingles, whatever finite set of things determines us, it turns out to be deterministic - whether it's one thing (emotions), or several things.

Marya: Go ahead Steve

Pablooba: yes I see your point Squish, but it seems like plenty of people love to watch this stuff - although I've seen it, and I have to admit the imagery stayed with me for weeks

Squish: shingles, I think it would make more sense to say that if all our motivations derived from rationality, then they would be (mostly) determined

Shingles: but we would perform a completely predictable set of actions over the course of our lives, sage

Steve: you say "our views on what is moral have changed"

Marya: yes indeed Steve

Squish: Pablo - I agree that people enjoy watching some horrible things... But if they had to experience it themselves, it'd be another story

Shingles: perhaps they would, I'm trying to highlight the role of choice, squish

Steve: true however suggest there is a distinction to be made between morality and ethics

Sage: no shingles, that gets into the determinism has nothing to do with free-will - but this is going far afield i think... =>

Alaya: shingles we cannot predict what it will do since it was not observable before....its only a guess again

Pun: Oswy, I think a degree of control is good, but too much of it will be destructive, as we never can precisely now all the facts the control should be based on.

Steve: morality is a code of conduct

Marya: I raised that point as an indicator of what we may view at a future point as being moral or important to us - may well not be the same as how we view it right now

Second Philosophy

Shingles: but if there is no other motivation than emotions it's completely determined, Sage

Pun: Oswy, and the guiding principle would, IMO, be to benefit the one the control is imposed on, and the society as a whole.

Pablooba: I cant talk from experience on it Squish, just videos, but I do know some guys who have seen this stuff real life, and it definitely alters them - it seems for the worse. They just seem to care less...

Dar: Steve, I thought morality was about what is good and what is bad, and that ethics was about living the good life.

Sage: there is still choice, shingles.

Squish: Marya - I agree with you that morality may change...definitely yes...it has already done so in our history. But there are also some basic moral tenets that have remained steady throughout humanity's history as well

Steve: ethics is how we treat one another in each and every singular instance

Pun: But if we can control everything, even the highest things such as desires, values, and motives, of an individual, then we can't know what all this control is for, as even the desires of a person can be controlled this way.

Shingles: no, because if emotions are 'all that motivates us' then choice is no longer a factor, sage

Parrot: morality is the compass...ethics is the action

Sage: no shingles, your conflating causality with determinism imo

Dar: nice parrot

Alaya: morality come from religion as good or bad... finite proprieties witch isn't existing, in a finite way, but according to a situation in place

Steve: ethics is the action goodness is the compass imho; this will not change as long as humans are human

Squeezy: people pick and choose what they like in a religion

Shingles: I admit I make that connection, but the flaw in the statement I point out is still there, sage

Squeezy: so I don't think morality comes from religion at all

Dar: why shouldn't they squeeze?

Squish: Dar, I think the point is that morality isn't derived from religion

Pun: Shingles, I believe that psychology simply states that emotions are a key factor in motivation. For instance, if we didn't feel enthusiastic about coming here, we probably wouldn't have come. But we don't need to say that it was the enthusiasm about coming here that was the sole thing behind our decision to come here.

Dar: the bible, if taken in whole and literally, is pretty nigh impossible and horrid.

Dar: ok

Alaya: moral choice isn't something to do ponder for , I rather be an objective observer of the real present impact of the present situation

Sage: I'd like to get back to the issue of how our value-structures could change with technology, since we seem to agree that technology might change them, and what we should be concerned about here, rather than trying to figure out whether emotions are "good" in some broader sense.

Shingles: I see that, I'm attempting to show how flawed the statement is that 'emotions are all that motivates us', Pun

Pun: Okay. You have my blessing.

Dar: I think the emphasis on emotions may be a mistake to begin with

Marya: Why, Dar?

Squish: that's interesting Dar - please elaborate :)

Oswy: I agree Sage let's get back to the impact of technology on our humanness

Dar: well, we only really know emotions subjectively

Sage: shingles, you might be defining them differently than i do, but the way i define them they are causal but not deterministic.

Dar: we can correlate brain states to what people say they feel

Squish: ok that seems to give an objective measure of emotions then

Dar: but, I'm not really sold on the idea that emotions and other qualia come down to the tech

Second Philosophy

Shingles: brb (will get back to you sage)

Dar: relationship, sure, but, we don't really know what experience itself is

Squish: hmmm...where would you say qualia come from, Dar?

Pun: Luckily, it seems modern science implies that complete control is impossible. That means a perfect dictatorship affected by scientific achievements won't happen.

Sage: so what kind of potentially problematic changes to our values do you see coming from technology? This is the key question imo

Dar: more useful to look at behaviours in this context I think

Dar: I don't know Squish

Pun: If someone wants that elaborated, I can.

Squish: Pun - I don't think science is trying to effect a dictatorship =S

Shingles: unless emotions are randomly generated somehow, I can't see how them being causal wouldn't be deterministic, sage

Marya: please do, Pun

Pun: Neither do I. I was talking about the possibility of using future technology to have complete, or at least a very high degree of, control over human minds.

Sage: Pun, I don't think science says that, but human nature might :)

Squish: hmm Pun - that's an interesting way to look at it. What if we considered, instead, how humans are trying to have control over human minds?

Alaya: emotion is only one part we feel, we have sentiments,, witch are different, level, not just reaction, witch are emotions,, and sentiments like affection,, or empathy.... so this isn't characterising human, animals have it...mammal mostly, what have we more to define ourselves isn't important, since these last one are really affected into the technology adaptation world we have... since the environment is completely redesign...now with all this

Shingles: the internet has already affected humanity's values on sexuality

Squish: shingles - you mean that people are more open about sexuality?

Oswy: If nano tech extended our lives to 150 years on average then our values would change

Squish: Oswy - agreed!

Pun: Laws of Quantum Physics and the Deterministic Chaos theory say that it's impossible to know precisely the state of a system. Even if the state of the entire universe was known, it would be impossible to process all that information and determine the change that should be done in the universe to achieve the desired result. Thus, complete control is impossible, because for complete control, it's necessary to precisely know everything about the system you want to control - and you can't do that.

Dar: Well, i think that the technologies of contraception have liberated sexuality from the practical concerns of procreation.

Sage: shingles, it's not just random, it's choice - the interpretations we accept or reject steer the course for our emotional development - but this is getting way far afield - trying to get back on topic :)

Squish: hmm Dar - that's interesting! I think it may be true from the POV of women... But for men?

Shingles: i mean that as a consequence of sexually explicit material becoming more widely available it has relegated the importance of it

Oswy: I have to say I don't think that that is the point the point is do we want to see values changed do we see that as a threat or not. I have already raised the issue that the tech may be available to some and not others are we happy to see two tiers of humanity?

Pun: But it's still possible to have a very high degree of control, even over people, if you have appropriate knowledge and technology.

Marya: I expect that may well happen Oswy - at least initially

Squish: er, shingles - "it has relegated the importance of it"...relegated to what?

Dar: Well, I suppose some less scrupulous men were never tied down by concerns of procreation, save for fathers of daughters.

Marya: I agree with that, Pun

Second Philosophy

Shingles: well, that last argument you made could boil down to 'we choose our own emotions', which is very on topic, sage?

Alaya: but human already control a lot actually, but not completely, just use everything in any way they want to, just for the invention of technology to do always new things, always new thing to find to do with those new things,, and it makes money

Sage: Pun, it's impossible to measure what's there now, but it is quite possible to change it to what you want. You don't know the system before you measured it, but you do know *exactly* what it is after you measured it.. It's perfectly possible in principle to build controlled machines - just not to know precisely what's outside your machine

Oswy: You could have a nightmare Platonic situation of an elite of enhanced rulers a sort of super FASCIST leadership.

Squish: 1984

Marya: That is true Alaya

Shingles: it's more widely available, hence its less of a big deal, squish

Pablooba: Alaya - I agree, but I think the fundamental purpose of technology is and has always been to make our lives easier. That's its underlying objective IMO.

Pun: Sage, the problem is that human society, and Earth, are systems which aren't isolated.

Squish: ah I see, shingles. Yet I think it still is a freaking big deal to everyone...that's why there is so much of the stuff...b/c the demand is endless.

Pun: Thus, an influence form outside can change everything, whether by the means of the butterfly effect, or something more crude, such as a meteorite hitting the earth, or aliens coming here and starting their own dictatorship over us.

Oswy: Pablo, that is the temptation Tech must help and so enhancements are good its good to be happy and live for 150 years but are we willing to sacrifice the idea of the human we have for that future. i think there some huge drawbacks

Pun: And I still claim that nothing can be measured precisely. Not even the states of simple systems. Such as a hydrogen atom. By precisely I mean exactly.

Marya: so, if technology changes our values, and makes humanity smarter - will we still hold the same values and will we still be so easily manipulated by the information we input?

Shingles: every measurement depends on the understanding of the unit in that case

Dar: Well, I don't think we need absolute precision to manipulate systems with high degrees of success

Squish: Marya - I think that we aim to be "smarter" so that we can find better ways of enhancing our experiences of life

Alaya: its not really true about the easier - not anymore, Pun, i went into many business meeting, and the most thing I hear is, let them believe there live will be more easy, let them believe they will have a future like they wish let them believe that ... so I don't see the betterness in all that really but lies...my washing machine was more easy to repair before, now its a informatik one panel of control, and it broke panel are cheap, so its not easier than before; its trouble product

Shingles: true, Dar

Marya: Indeed Squish

Pun: I agree. But if we want nothing to ever go wrong, we need to know all, and we need to know it exactly.

Sage: Pun, I never said you can measure unknown things precisely. But that is separate from control. It's perfectly possible for instance for one mind to maintain complete control over the earth. Sure, they wouldn't be in control of stuff outside, but that's life lol. But this is another digression lol.

Alaya: new thing to change to buy new one to change to throw away new one

Squish: Marya - that's why I think there are some basic values that won't change

Marya: what do you think wouldn't change Squish?

Squish: our desire to enjoy things, to find meaning, to feel that life is worthwhile

Marya: Though I'm really enjoying the convo between Sage & Pun

Second Philosophy

Pun: Alright. Well, I stated my opinion, and I won't torture the discussion with being too offtopic anymore.

Shingles: that sounds incredibly unlikely, sage

Sage: right squishy

Alaya: I can propose to see the DVD manufactured landscape you'll see

Dar: your comments were welcome Pun

Marya: Not off topic Pun - it is very interesting to see how this is going :)

Pun: Alright, then.

Sojourna: Any thoughts on how human emotions have changed/development since the Industrial Revolution? Just to see how technology has impacted on emotionality since then? Instead of theorising about the unknown future?

Alaya: Pun, I respect your point of view – I just respond, from my position

Pun nods.

Shingles: we need thought-experiments in all cases, so off-topic isn't too important

Shingles: the term*

Squish: Soj - I don't know much about how humans felt before the IR, but I think many human emotions have stayed the same

Squish: ones that I listed above

Dar: well, maybe if Marya could drill down on the topic more precisely and give us a hypothetical and specific situation to consider instead of us talking in generalities.

Marya: I agree with that Shing - we can keep generally on topic but I like to see how the train of thoughts develop - we are a small enough group to keep it coherent so it's all good

Pun: Well, I don't think it's possible for one mind to have complete control over Earth. What do you mean by 'complete control', by the way? Does it include knowing the position of every particle at every time?

Shingles: yes, I'm sure we can keep to that, Marya

Alaya: I answer that with a DVD to see, about the impact it has on lives since china is our biggest furnish industrial worlds I was completely reverse emotional when I saw the impact on lives over there that is hidden from us, since we don't produce what we buy.....

Marya: What is your view on what has changed Soj?

Squish: Pun, isn't one thing omnipotence and the other thing omniscience?

Sage: I think the most interesting question is related to how are values affected by increasingly taking for granted our ability to control our environment.

Squish: Sage - I think technology has led to some depersonalization and, perhaps, some dehumanization

Squish: but I believe the core values stay the same

Alaya: if we would be the producer of all the fabrication of the things we use in technologies, we will be come like mechanical robots

Pun: I believe that omnipotence has to include omniscience.

Alaya: producing and using, producing and using

Pun: As I said, to have complete control over a system, you have to know it completely.

Squish: Pun - that's interesting :) Is it possible to have power over something without proper knowledge of it?

Shingles: What makes them core (sorry, i think I missed it), Squish?

Oswy: Soj this is a huge area but one thing that has changed is our view of group dynamics. I think industrial society gave rise to thinking about class as an issue of value for instance and made us more aware of the dynamics of industry and the creation of wealth and how it should be divided in society. These became greater issues in human consciousness

Pun: Power, yes. Complete power, no.

Alaya: this is what the world as become in this movie but on a scale that is blowing all proportion

Sojourna: Hmm, well I think emotions like love are more widespread now, whereas I believe prior to IR people would wed for practical purposes and economic ones rather than love. Depression might be a more widespread emotion, too. Technology gives us more time to think and contemplate on our lives, whereas before IR we'd be out in the fields all day....

Second Philosophy

Sage: I would say yes, squishy. Some parts don't matter, and as long as you can reliably change them to do whatever you want, whenever you want, their exact state isn't important.

Alaya: journalist are not aloud to film that in china

Squish: shingles - I mentioned that our desire to enjoy life, to seek meaning and value, etc. are constant human endeavours

Squish: er, emotions -

Alaya: its was made because it was artist.... but u should see it

Shingles: ok ty, squish

Sojourna: That's interesting, Oswy, thanks.

Oswy: Soj Ironically I think that the technology of enhancement may make us think about these issues more deeply ie how we should share enhancement through the human population

Pablooba: how do you define complete power though?

Marya: That's great Oswy & Soj

Shingles: as godlike, Pablo?

Pablooba: the ability to create and destroy?

Pun: Well... I guess we could create several types of complete power.

Squish: what about the ability to influence?

Shingles: omnipotence over it, Pablo

Sage: Yes Sojourna, I agree with you there - technology enables more emotion, not less imo.

Pun: Changing anything at any time in any way would be one class.

Squish: Soj and Sage - also agreed there. Without the conveniences of technology, human beings are concerned with a much more narrow range of things

Pun: The class I had in mind most of the time during the conversation was - to be able to bring a system to the desired state, no matter how much time it takes.

Marya: Very interesting turn there - technology enabling 'more' emotion :)

Pun: But the problem is that, as modern science implies, a state of the system can't be perfectly known.

Sage: Pun, well that's also possible, but not really practical - don't know why you'd want to do that. As long as you can prove that the state is unable to escape your ability to do whatever you want, the variations aren't important.

Squish: which may lead to a wider range of emotion

Alaya: Sojourna I can see this illusion of a better living with to many technologies,, making us dream about human happiness, but in reality we pay our little slave the other side of the world who have no choice than to loose the country ways they had,,, just living into massive city of industries, taller than giant 10 football stadium, and for our progress and dream of human life

Sage: Pun, it is known right after you measure it. Just not before.

Shingles: IMO inter-connectivity is such a powerfully life-altering quality that can only grow in the close future

Sojourna: Well, Sage, I'm just thinking about the change in the emotional spectrum since IR, not sure whether future tech developments will expand spectrum of emotions or narrow....we are in a middle phase and unaccustomed to tech so our emotions may also be a but all over the place because of this....

Pun: Sage, but with time, it will probably be shown otherwise. Long-term weather forecast isn't possible, for instance.

Marya: Shingles that is also interesting - a step closer to a kind of collective perhaps? :)

Sage: pun, that's prediction, not control.

Sojourna: Alaya, yes....

Pun: True. Although...

Alaya: we are involved with other people life in that.. it is a chain way of living we must look at

Dar: I think technology will come and we shall adapt. I don't foresee a time where we have much control over how that happens.

Pun: Changes might be happening, which you can't discover until it's too late.

Marya: Perhaps no more control than we have now over our present state of affairs, Dar?

Second Philosophy

Sage: that is true now pun, but that is definitely not physically necessary

Pun: They might not be detectable now, but they'll become detectable one day, probably.

Alaya: so I agree for technology but we have to see our neighbour, and choose also that the impact will not lose their life

Shingles: well, considering the compound possibilities of online sites, and the blur between phones and the web, I think it is the potent factor in our recent culture, Marya

Dar: how much have we ever had over our current state of affairs?

Oswy: Squish I am sure that we can enhance all sorts of areas visual perception is one hearing another sensitivity of touch another. The issue is should we do this why might we want to and do we allow one group of humans with this enhancement to emerge?

Marya: I agree with that Shingles

Pun: Weather forecast will be possible to make longer and longer in advance, but according to modern science, it won't be possible to make for -any- time in the future.

Marya: Fair question Dar

Pun: Because we can't know the exact state of the system.

Sage: pun, if you let it run its course and don't try to control it, that is certainly true - but that's not relevant here lol

Pun: More precisely we know the state, then longer in advance can we make predictions.

Alaya: this is the how much of it, yes, and how much we gain, for those who lose being into the chain of this technologies world

Pun: But we never know it perfectly precisely.

Shingles: there is even a solar-panelled handbag, for charging your phone. We are stepping closer and closer to being cybernetic creatures

Alaya: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x4eLsRUbtBk>

Shingles: But I suspect we will be reluctant to install bodily implants

Marya: Link up there - we have little to no control now over the present state of affairs (because we do not know or cannot know everything about it) and this will be much the same in the future

Alaya: this is the life it make, and they cant talk during work

Pun: Also, if we wanted to type the exact location of every water molecule in clouds into the computer that makes weather forecast, we'd need an infinite number of digits for every water molecule. And the computer would thus need infinite storage space and an infinite amount of time to calculate the predictions.

Alaya: you can see the outstanding proportion in that doc

Sage: that level of detail simply isn't necessary to have complete control, pun.

Squish: er...that wasn't one of the problems discussed by him

Alaya: we come from nature, but we are not connected anymore... in the proportion we are living tech now

Pablooba: Pun, its been said that eventually just 1 or 2 computers will be all we need - once they crack the quantum computer - the power of this will be way beyond what we have nowadays

Pun: Let's make the discussion less abstract. What kind of control, for instance, would be complete control over the Earth?

Shingles: although our world is still reliant on natures present status quo, Alaya

Oswy: Alaya I think there is truth in that and its up to us to decide how far we want the process of creating a new different nature should go. We can exercise some control over these issue but its a political choice. We are not helpless.

Alaya: the proportion are already pass out

Shingles: if the ocean conveyor belts stops, we all die, Alaya

Alaya: for me the line is attain

Shingles: if the ocean acidifies too much, we all die, Alaya

Alaya: we have enough

Dar: would be nice, I agree, for quality to be placed over disposability and turn over

Second Philosophy

Oswy: Alaya there is a feature called geo engineering that can improve the environment but there are serious ethical issues about using it.

Dar: "ending is better than mending", lol

Squish: you said it was an official free for all :)

Pun: I'll AFK for 10 minutes or so. I'm still waiting for Sage's answer.

Sage: Well Pun, I'd say that the ability to control everything you *care* about, and to be able to prove that the other stuff (on the earth that is) is in such a state that can't interfere with that control. But you don't need to know the exact state.

Pablooba: Oswy, are you talking about the ability to control hurricanes? Where they put some chemicals into the clouds?

Alaya: its because we don't see what the reality is completely of our consumption of technologies, for me its already far enough what i see in this video..

Oswy: The problem is Alaya that the technologies are constantly tempting longer life better health enhanced physical and possibly mental powers these are hard to resist and I am not sure they should be in all cases but we need global management of their advance and that we dont have yet.

Sage: What I find fascinating is how important *not* having control is to the creation of meaning, pleasure, happiness.

Sage: and how that will fit into technology.

Squish: yes agreed Sage - I think it is very important to find resistance in our quest for things

Squish: perhaps the only thing I learned from Heidegger

Marya: Great point there Sage

Shingles: I would say we need to witness everything, especially the unpleasant

Alaya: you should see the proportion of the truck to carry large amount of tress and too many much as nature can put back on, in the time so for our generation, it lack of oxygen, in a time we will not breath the next tres generation

Marya: This has been a point of curiosity for me - with regards to creativity

Sage: As a consequence of this need, I think that the ability to control more and more will lead to some very interesting choices made by people to asses who they consider trustworthy enough to relinquish various domains of that control to, in order for their control to mean something, anything.

Squish: oh right Marya - sorry to back track - Bostrom discussions how technology shouldn't be thought of solely in terms of eliminating negatives from human nature

Squish: god I'm ten years too late saying that

Shingles: There is already a modern nobility dynamic, it works through money, sage

Alaya: look the link I gave you, and many few beside of proportion u can see the context that is taken in a snapping finger, we create with our technology huge way to do thing in a faster and more efficient also for to take away the ecosystem

Oswy: I was reading some interesting work about how we might be able to use enhancements in the brain to cure serious depression. The doctors were all for this as long as the patient had control. I suppose you could see the point but it soon led on to the idea of having the ability to have electrodes that made you happy at will. I am not sure that is a power we want to give humanity.

Sage: shingles - that's different - nobility is related to the exchange of power for security - but when security is a given, there is still an exchange of power for pleasure and meaning.

Oswy: Is it really happiness if you can turn it on and off or a form of addiction?

Squish: Oswy - I agree there is something to be wary about there. Somehow that would rob many things of meaning/value for me

Alaya: don't be blind security in you nice environment now I base on the lost of other part f the world destruction in massive ways

Shingles: As I understand nobility, it is about ones social position, like a pecking order, sage

Sage: sure shingles, there is that too, but both that and the exchange for security are separate from what i was talking about.

Second Philosophy

Alaya: when it was in our backyard we were seeing it

Pun: Well, one of the problems is that a closed system tends to destruct. After billions of years, if we confine the Solar system and don't allow external influences, all will turn into things which aren't good enough to sustain life. We can't have control there, it seems.

Shingles: actually, as I was driving at that it is this newly installed nobility that will be given these privileged positions of power you were talking about, I think it wholly relevant, sage

Pun: Entropy of a closed system can only rise, and the net change decreases net organisedness of the system. A human being is a very organized system, for instance. Entropy keeps rising, and sooner or later, the amount of entropy will imply that all humans are gone.

Pun: Control, as defined by Sage, can work, but not forever.

Pun: It might last a lifetime. I can agree with that.

Sage: well nothing works forever in the universe, pun =) But it can last until the sun dies lol.

Pun: It might last thousands of years. But it can't last for any amount of time.

Pun: Right.

Shingles: these issues of security are tenuous too; any agent may violate a contract at any point

Sage: but the entropy argument doesn't apply pun when the sun's around =)

Squish: what the heck is this warning about transacting and handling valuable assets?

Squish: oh

Pun: Entropy of Earth, perhaps. But I was viewing the solar system as the system in question. If it's isolated, its entropy can only rise. And I said the assumption is that it's isolated.

Sage: Well shingles, i think that some people will certainly have much more talent in creating meaning for people than others, and hence in that sense there is a nobility, yes. But this is not a bad thing imo - it's just how things are :)

Sage: err will be

Shingles: but they are not the nobility, sage; the lords and ladies are the super rich

Shingles: regardless of education or breeding, the rich are our social betters it seems

Sage: shingles, I thought we were talking about my comment about what drives us to relinquish power when we have security - we relinquish our wealth to the nobility now for various types of security and risk-pooling, but with that gone, all your left with is the creation of meaning and pleasure.

Shingles: I'm sure that history shows the generation of meaning and pleasure has little to do with the nobles, sage

Sage: shingles, why is that relevant to the case here? I thought we were talking about the effects of long-term advances in technology, no?

Shingles: because those are the people that will be in the positions of power you spoke about, as we gain more control over our environment whether we consent to it or not

Sage: Shingles, the process i was describing was one of us choosing who we trust to give power to in order to receive pleasure in return. I don't see any particular reason we'd be required to pick someone who was rich due to the past. We'd just choose someone we trusted imo. The reason nobility rose in the past were related to security, which is a completely different dynamic, is all I was saying.

Shingles: we wouldn't choose them. They would simply distribute what already belonged to them, sage; choice plays a miniscule role in the actuality of this

Sage: I'm not sure if we're talking about the same thing at all shingles...

Alaya: you don't give really power,, to that, since forces are already determine by this moment,, but you can measure who has more power ... and decide from that

Alaya: when you meet a bear, you can decide if you give power??? Or you have to learn how to cop

Shingles: well, roles in a social contract might've been a less confusing term, 'power' has many connotations

Sage: You seem to be talking about economic decisions that affect broader policy perhaps? I'm talking about personal power over your individual, that has to be given voluntarily.

Pun: Sage, the idea of control I had in mind was: to determine exactly all future states of a system, by controlling the controlled system via a controller system.

Second Philosophy

Alaya: I'm not talking about policy hehehe, where did you see that

Sage: sorry I meant shingles, Alaya

Shingles: I can stab someone to death if I choose to, they do not have to consent for me to have power over them in this way, s

Alaya: they just learn to cope with this kind of power, get train.. for it

Sage: umm sure, shingles... but i don't think future governments will be permitting that... lol Exactly whose in charge politically isn't really all that important as long as they're somewhat reasonable.

Shingles: yes they would punish me if I acted that way

Sage: In any case, it's in the long-term interests of those in power to let people make their own choices. Maximizes growth and such.

Alaya: they only control a style of balance that people live in a economic stable place , the other individual thing is only at a small scale, into you social services

Shingles: I should hope it is, however politicians have this annoying tendency to think in the short term, sage

Alaya: and the growth in America is at a level where people cost too much; they do in other country the business for development

Sage: sure shingles - though the 'long-term' becomes shorter and shorter-term as things change faster and faster imo =)

Shingles: and the stabbing example was simply to over turn the proposal that power relationships are consensual

Sage: Shingles - I was talking about a new kind of power relationship shingles, and arguing that it would come to dominate over the old kind. I assuredly wasn't claiming this to be the case now.

Alaya: poor American are not finding jobs, unless selling Wal-Mart things they will not develop, because Mexican cost less and Turkish too and Chinese and Indonesian. Personal development will be done knowing they some are the next generation to take over what is done... and not developing

Shingles: and I am trying to show that force is how any power is attained, Sage

Pun: I guess economics simply became more developed in the direction they're currently headed in, Alaya.

Cutting down wages is just another way to minimize costs of production. That would've been done whether it's necessary for survival of a company or not - it's just what is considered good business practice nowadays.

Alaya: and people can fight against one another believing they will get a place, the place are already attribute to the one that follow the path already done, an making the machine stay as it is. No revolution is possible now, even in an individual power relation ship to take place among the council, or a group cause the way market s does work only woks in some ways now

