



ASK A GENIUS  
SET VI

BY SCOTT DOUGLAS JACOBSEN  
&  
RICK ROSNER

IN-SIGHT PUBLISHING

Published by In-Sight Publishing  
In-Sight Publishing  
Langley, British Columbia, Canada

in-sightjournal.com

First published in parts by In-Sight: Independent Interview-Based Journal,  
a member of In-Sight Publishing, 2016-2018  
This edition published in 2018

© 2012-2018 by Scott Douglas Jacobsen.

All rights reserved.

No parts of this collection may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized, in any form, or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented or created, which includes photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without written permission from the publisher.

Published in Canada by In-Sight Publishing, British Columbia, Canada, 2018  
Distributed by In-Sight Publishing, Langley, British Columbia, Canada

In-Sight Publishing was established in 2014 as a not-for-profit alternative to the large, commercial publishing houses currently dominating the publishing industry.

In-Sight Publishing operates in independent and public interests rather than for private gains, and is committed to publishing, in innovative ways, ways of community, cultural, educational, moral, personal, and social value that are often deemed insufficiently profitable. Thank you for the download of this e-book, your effort, interest, and time support independent publishing purposed for the encouragement of academic freedom, creativity, diverse voices, and independent thought.

*Cataloguing-in-Publication Data*

No official catalogue record for this book.

Jacobsen, Scott Douglas, Author

Ask A Genius: Set VI/Scott Douglas Jacobsen

pages cm

Includes bibliographic references, footnotes, and reference style listing.

In-Sight Publishing, Langley, British Columbia, Canada

Published electronically from In-Sight Publishing in Langley, British Columbia, Canada

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

*Designed by Scott Douglas Jacobsen*

# Contents

i	Dedications.....	4
ii	Ask A Genius 266 - Genius, Sex, and Judgment.....	5
iii	Ask A Genius 267 - Women's Better Judgment.....	6
iv	Ask A Genius 268 - Sociobiological Perspective.....	7
v	Ask A Genius 269 - Conservative and Liberal Thought.....	8
vi	Ask A Genius 270 - Bi-directional Sensationalism.....	9
vii	Ask A Genius 271 - Watergate, Vietnam, Nixon.....	10
viii	Ask A Genius 272 - Three Points of View on America.....	12
ix	Ask A Genius 273 - Free Will and Jurisprudence.....	13
x	Ask A Genius 274 - Longer and Healthier.....	14
xi	Ask A Genius 275 - The Future for Kindness.....	15
xii	Ask A Genius 276 - The Future for Kindness (2).....	16
xiii	Ask A Genius 277 - The Future for Kindness (3).....	17
xiv	Ask A Genius 277 - The Future for Kindness (3).....	18
xv	Ask A Genius 279 - A-Atheist (1).....	19
xvi	Ask A Genius 280 - A-Atheist (2).....	20
xvii	Ask A Genius 281 - A-Atheist (3).....	21
xviii	Ask A Genius 282 - A-Atheist (4).....	22
xix	Ask A Genius 283 - A-Atheist (5).....	23
xx	Ask A Genius 284 - A-Atheist (6).....	24
xxi	Ask A Genius 285 - A-Atheist (7).....	25
xxii	Ask A Genius 286 - Apocalypse Now, For You (1).....	26
xxiii	Ask A Genius 287 - Apocalypse Now, For You (2).....	27
xxiv	Ask A Genius 288 - Apocalypse Now, For You (3).....	28
xxv	Ask A Genius 289 - Apocalypse Now, For You (4).....	29
xxvi	Ask A Genius 290 - Innovations in the Future.....	30
xxvii	Ask A Genius 291 - Universal Basic Income (1).....	32
xxviii	Ask A Genius 292 - Universal Basic Income (2).....	33
xxix	Ask A Genius 293 - Universal Basic Income (3).....	34
xxx	Ask A Genius 294 - Universal Basic Income (4).....	35
xxxi	Ask A Genius 295 - Universal Basic Income (5).....	36
xxxii	Ask A Genius 296 - Universal Basic Income (6).....	37
xxxiii	Ask A Genius 297 - Universal Basic Income (7).....	38
xxxiv	Ask A Genius 298 - Universal Basic Income (8).....	39
xxxv	Ask A Genius 299 - Edenbargain (1).....	40
xxxvi	Ask A Genius 300 - Edenbargain (2).....	41
xxxvii	Ask A Genius 301 - Edenbargain (3).....	42
xxxviii	Ask A Genius 302 - Sensory Systems and Consciousness (1).....	43
xxxix	Ask A Genius 303 - Sensory Systems and Consciousness (2).....	44
xl	Ask A Genius 304 - Science Faction and Fiction (1).....	45
xli	Ask A Genius 305 - Science Faction and Fiction (2).....	46
xl.ii	Ask A Genius 306 - Los Angeles Collapse.....	47
xl.iii	Ask A Genius 307 - Constructivist and Essentialist Consciousness (1).....	48
xl.iv	Ask A Genius 308 - Constructivist and Essentialist Consciousness (2).....	49
xl.v	Ask A Genius 309 - Constructivist and Essentialist Consciousness (3).....	50
xl.vi	Ask A Genius 310 - Constructivist and Essentialist Consciousness (4).....	51
xl.vii	Ask A Genius 311 - Constructivist and Essentialist Consciousness (5).....	52
xl.viii	Ask A Genius 312 - Constructivist and Essentialist Consciousness (6).....	53
xl.ix	Ask A Genius 313 - Constructivist and Essentialist Consciousness (7).....	54
l	Ask A Genius 314 - Constructivist and Essentialist Consciousness (8).....	55
li	Ask A Genius 315 - Markets, Mothers, and Climate Change (1).....	56
lii	Ask A Genius 316 - Markets, Mothers, and Climate Change (2).....	57
liii	Ask A Genius 317 - Markets, Mothers, and Climate Change (3).....	58
li.v	Ask A Genius 318 - Markets, Mothers, and Climate Change (4).....	59

LIV	Ask A Genius 319 – Markets, Mothers, and Climate Change (5).....	60
LVI	Ask A Genius 320 – Markets, Mothers, and Climate Change (6).....	62
LVII	Ask A Genius 321 – Mating Strategies (1).....	64
LVIII	Ask A Genius 322 – Mating Strategies (2).....	65
LIX	Ask A Genius 323 – Mating Strategies (3).....	66
LX	Ask A Genius 324 – The Feynman Thing (1).....	68
LXI	Ask A Genius 325 – The Feynman Thing (2).....	69
LXII	Ask A Genius 326 – Divinity and Human Exaltation.....	70
LXIII	Ask A Genius 327 - Comedy Change.....	71
LXIV	Ask A Genius 328 - The Future.....	72
LXV	Ask A Genius 329 - The Worst President.....	74
LXVI	Ask A Genius 330 - No One Expects the Spanish Inquisition.....	77
LXVII	Ask A Genius 331 - Science and Religion (1).....	78
LXVIII	Ask A Genius 332 - Science and Religion (2).....	80
LXIX	Ask A Genius 333 - Science and Religion (3).....	81
LXX	Ask A Genius 334 - Science and Religion (4).....	82
LXXI	Ask A Genius 335 – Science and Religion (5).....	83
LXXII	Ask A Genius 336 – AIs Wants and Types.....	84
LXXIII	Ask A Genius 337 - When the Presidenting Gets Tough, the Tough Twitter.....	88
LXXIV	Ask A Genius 338 - Pain, Pain, Go Away, Come Back Another Day.....	90
LXXV	Ask A Genius 339 - Godspeed - God Willing Means God Fearing.....	94
LXXVI	Ask A Genius 340 - Intelligence as Refuge and Strength.....	95
LXXVII	License and Copyright.....	99

## Dedications

To three generations of women who support and tolerate me - my mom, Ruth, my wife, Carole,

my daughter, Isabella.

Rick

To the love in my life.

Scott

# Ask A Genius 266 - Genius, Sex, and Judgment

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 21, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** Off-tape, we were discussing things. Alright so, we left off saying that receiver to be more wild ass or weird male super geniuses than female super geniuses. And one reason may be that just women have better judgment and that part of being a really smart woman might be looking at life in general and deciding that leading a normal life just makes sense. Because I've certainly had crap periods of my life based on following my own weird plans. Plans that if you look at them in the aggregate, you could argue that I deserve to lose a bunch of points off my IQ for pursuing these plans, you know. I tend to think I'm not a psychopath or a sociopath or maybe only like 5 or 10% on the way to being one, but I tend to think that a really good sociopath would not do anything sociopathic because in a cold unemotional sociopathic way, the sociopath would look at the way to live a smooth life, a life without hassle and decide yeah I'll just pretend to be a normal person. I won't do a bunch of the horrible, antisocial stuff just because the cost of doing the antisocial stuff is just too high.

The reason I like that the same way I like the idea of a super villain in comic books or movies who takes a look at his record of going up against superheroes and is like fuck it this I get beat every time. I'm just gonna retire and offer my services to the good guys and you know I come up with great shit it just turns out to not be quite great enough I could certainly help out the Justice League. I know that the villains have something in them that that even when they try to be good for like an issue or two of a comic book something just snaps and they go back to pure badness. But really I mean it would be so much easier for to not be evil.

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: The entire premise is hysterical.**

**Rick Rosner:** I like; I want to see a whole movie it would piss off people so bad. I want to see a Marvel movie where the superheroes take care of the problem in the first 10 minutes of the movie, took 20 minutes. And their next you know 90 minutes of the movie is just the kind of hanging out, solving little problems you know like designing a dream house, just doing like regular people you know seeing if they can get a buzz how much you know how many how many shots of Baileys Irish cream would it take to get Superman buzz?

Probably wouldn't want to use Bailey's, you've end up he does a super throwing up before he gets drunk. But anyway, maybe you were doing do it with superheroes maybe you'd do it with a group of teens that goes to you know a spooky place like if you buy the rights to it, a shitty like you know series of movies or a series of movies that's run its course you know the Jason movies or the Freddy movies and you know they take care of the bad guy like very thoroughly in the first ten minutes. And they just spend the rest of the movie like hanging out and wandering a little bit if he's just going to come back in some weird way. But mostly just hanging out.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 267 - Women's Better Judgment

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 22, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Why do you think women have better judgment? From your analysis women that are super intelligent?**

**Rick Rosner:** This is a risky topic to go into because you know I if I were the president of Harvard I could end up losing my job.

Yeah you suggested that there were, what'd he do, that there are more very smart men and very smart women or some crap like that? I don't know, he said something like that it was stupid and he lost his job. But out there one possible explanation is that women have a thicker corpus callosum and which is the cable that connects the two halves of your brain, so people like to say that, that means that women think more holistically. They think more than they have less of an action potential that's not the right term for it. But women are less likely to take impulsive action which may be evidence of more global smartness, it may be lower levels of testosterone, it may be largely cultural that we expect more action from men than from women. It may be that the women have stronger family bonds than some men like the Polgar sisters. I think their dad is the one who got them started on chess though I'm not sure and it may be that you know that they just were led into this life of chess 24/7, which doesn't leave time for you know drug fund and you know throwing stock stuff off the top of the Empire State Building I don't know. It didn't there is a theory that they're just fewer outlying women in general than there are men but that's the thing that got Larry Summers fired from Harvard. But without making it a general thing, you might be able to speculate there are fewer assholes who are women than guys. And but that's where the speculation has to stop if I ever want to be president of Harvard.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 268 - Sociobiological Perspective

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 23, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** Alright, one more possibility is the sociobiological perspective which basically boils down to eggs expensive, sperm cheap. Women's part of the reproductive process is being pregnant for 39 what, 40 weeks and then having to raise the kids for years and years and years. Guys can get away with just like jacking into somebody and you could argue that socio biologically, women have a bigger stake in non-dumb shit behavior. That there may be a biological bias in women of being responsible. At the very least they have to stay alive for nine and a half months to birth the baby and then traditionally they nurse the baby for a year or two years, so that's right there you're looking at 2 -3 years of not being a wild ass hole. Yet you know there are plenty of guys who are successful at making somebody pregnant and then making themselves dead by being an idiot and you know the species goes on. So I don't know is that I don't feel like that's too horribly sexist an idea, but you know there are plenty of species worth of the males do the child-rearing and the hanging around

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Is that historically our species?**

**Rosner:** Not historically though I learned in women's studies that their prehistorically it may be the case. That pre historically, we humans may have lived in matriarch ease. It were, had a lot less asshole eerie, because women were in charge. There was community, there was free love, there was there weren't Wars, I don't know if there's evidence for that but you know it works pretty well on Wonder Woman's Island where there are no guys at all. Leave that last part out cuz it's really stupid or not I don't care anyway that's it.

[End of recorded material]



## Ask A Genius 269 - Conservative and Liberal Thought

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 24, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** Okay so, anyway, so I mean one part of the conservative thought level is to convince people that they don't need to, they've naturally the things they believe as good patriotic Americans, which pollutes hating liberals and thinking about all this stuff doesn't need to be examined. But they have naturally arrived at the proper way of, being American.

And the Liberals have their own thought bubble, which being liberal I think is closer to the truth that the Republicans stated agenda of Liberty and turning everybody into a success via lower taxes and fewer regulations, is really just kissing ass to rich donors who are the ones who help them get elected and help make them rich through buddy-buddy deals.

It's clear to liberals that the Republican agenda says a bunch of things about liberty and opportunity for all and making America great. But that it's really just funneling money to rich people and then we have statistics to back it up showing that middle-class wages are stagnant from 1974 and that 80% or 90 % of the growth in wealth in America since the early 70s, has gone to the top 10% or even less than that top two percent. But the Republicans work to make rich people win.

But you know I spend a lot of time looking at news throughout the day, and accumulating a lot of half understood or half-digested facts that tend to point to liberals who say that Trump is a terrible president who lies all the time, all this stuff the news I absorb pull all points in that direction it's backed up via transcripts and like there's a thing going on with a set rich deal which he's a DNC worker who was murdered and there's a whole possible conspiracy between the White House and Fox News to push the idea that Rich was murdered, because he leaked stuff to WikiLeaks, but there's no evidence of that but and it's pretty nonsensical and the Private Eye who was working on it is suing Fox News, saying that they've misquoted him about the case.

So anyway like as a liberal I see a lot of actual news and that news includes news about conservatives fabricating news to excuse their excesses. And I could you could say that it's symmetrical on the other side the Conservatives see a lot of news about how liberals are full of shit and to that extent it is symmetrical except that it's not really because the news that liberals are seeing is largely true and a lot of the news that conservatives are seeing is spin and bullshit and cherry-picking facts.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 270 - Bi-directional Sensationalism

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 25, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Both are right insofar as the other side is sensationalist, with or without the facts that make the difference.**

**Rick Rosner:** Yeah I mean the deal the New START TV news started out as a non-profit making thing at the beginning of TV in the late 40s. The FCC said we are going to rent the airwaves to broadcasters for almost nothing. But you the broadcaster's in return for this which will help you build a thriving TV industry, you were going to do us this favor or not favor you're going to be a provide a public service of doing national news every day.

So we have an informed population and the news was not a money-making thing it was 15 minutes a night, in 1949 and 1951, I just you know nobody expected it to make money, it was just a thing that the networks did to live up to the terms of their deal with the government.

And then people found a way to make news make money the beginning of that may have been morning news chat shows, on the on the big three networks like Good Morning America, The Today Show, these ended up growing to be three-hour and in one case like I think three or four hour shows, that present the news but present a lot of other stuff and occupy a huge chunk of the day and sell a lot of ads.

And then CNN or yes CNN came along and various profit oriented news programming came along and now almost all TV news is for profit and newspapers struggle to survive news blogs news feeds like Huffington Post and Drudge Report you know, struggle to hold an audience or gain an audience. So yeah all of them engage in a lot of sensationalism and a lot of little tricks to make the news that they're presenting seem more immediate and more important and more shocking and the whole thing. But if you would go, what's going on with Trump is shocking where you got a guy who just lies every day. We've never had a president like this.

Even the worst other presidents during our lifetime were decent people. I mean you can argue that Nixon was no heart was a horrible person but Nixon still was pretty civic minded in a lot of ways. He wanted to accomplish things in the world to put American in a better position. He did a lot of you know he was psychologically complex, you know developed enemies lists and he was always trying to screw over people and brewed it a lot, but he still believed he believed strongly in America and embraced policies that he thought would make America better and it's hard to know just what Trump thinks.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 271 - Watergate, Vietnam, Nixon

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 26, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Why did they think this?**

**Rick Rosner:** Well because he did some shit that didn't work, he gave a speech about national malaise. He said that we need to you know work hard to I don't know well I don't know why he talked about America being bombed out. I mean we were to some extent we've been disillusioned by Watergate, and by the Vietnam War and we were just coming out of that, but saying that America was bombed out, did not wasn't something that people responded well to. He gave a speech from The Oval Office wearing a sweater saying that we needed to turn down our thermostats to save energy and we needed to drive cars that weren't so gas does when people didn't respond well to that. He tried to free the hostages from Iran and the mission didn't work. He boycotted the Moscow Olympics because Moscow had invaded Afghanistan. So conservatives don't think that he made America a stronger country, but I don't but throughout it all and throughout his previous life previous to being president, and he's had a long, long life he quit being president beginning 1981, so that's more than 36 years ago.

He's had a huge run in his post presidential life and he's always been a figure of kind of decency and he's taught Sunday school for most of those years since he was president. He's a decent, decent guy and

**Jacobsen: If someone sees this insidious other would see it as not, opinions differ on Sunday schools.**

**Rosner:** Well no but regardless of how what you think of Sunday school Jimmy Carter is an upstanding guy.

**Jacobsen: It's good in so far as apple pie America is good.**

**Rosner:** Jimmy Carter is a good man all right he's a good guy. He may not have been the best president but he is an upstanding man, a godly man and

**Jacobsen: That's a general analysis, I was looking at the particular of Sunday school.**

**Rosner:** Yeah but I don't want to get off on I don't want to talk we're not talking about that we're talking about how we've never had like a charlatan and a compulsive liar as a president before.

**Jacobsen: Well a Nixon character a general character you can look at the philandering of Trump.**

**Rosner:** Well yeah but I mean I'm like yes Clinton was philandering but still was, his not trying to screw over the country. We never had a guy who's so morally compromised as Trump. We've

had guys with like specific areas of weakness; Clinton and his dick, Nixon and his enemies list, but anyway each side has its tactics with the conservatives having better tactics to shut down debate and in some cases shut down thought. Shut down you know skepticism about their beliefs that.

**Jacobsen: Is America a thinking culture in general? on critical thinking culture?**

**Rosner:** It depends on when you catch us. America is a rugged westward whore culture civilization of the country that boldly you know expands across the continent and builds and makes and yeah we have inventors and stuff but we are a people of action. Then in 1957, the Russians put Sputnik up everybody freaks out and we decide that we need to make America a more math science culture. And in fact we do, we from the time you know it's less than years in the time Kennedy says we need to get a man on the moon to having men off.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 272 - Three Points of View on America

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 27, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** Alright, in my lifetime there have been three points of view about thinking in America. When I was a little kid... actually I missed the first one, which was pure kind of rugged individualist culture, but that has... a thick rope running through American culture. Then you have... we have to get smarter to beat Russia deal which kicked in a couple of years before I was born.

Then you have the nerdism triumphant... with people my age in their 30's becoming billionaires by creating Apple and Microsoft, Cisco and just the whole internet industry, the digital information processing industry. Now you... all of these things they are not abrupt as they are in the existing culture and differ from region to region. From whatever people... among whatever people you hang out with, now another overlay on America is... belligerent ignorance that we are not going to believe anything that doesn't back up our point of view.

We are going to believe that evolution is a tool of the Godless, who want to abort our babies, believe that climate change is a conspiracy... to keep us scared and turn us socialist. Or the Chinese might be behind it according to Trump. So you have these various overlays so... I would say in General; America might be less of an intellectual country... but because we have one of the bigger populations among the world's countries, and because we have an excellent education system... though it is under attack.

We are still a place for a lot of stuff based on productive thinking to go on. But we like to think ourselves as cowboys and Rambo's... driving a pickup truck with a big American flag on it. Unlike Finland we do not have... nights that last for two and half months in the winter, where we sit around and drink and think, or out doing and building. That's it.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 273 - Free Will and Jurisprudence

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 28, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: So, what about free will and the system jurisprudence especially the United States and in a culture that has metaphysical assumptions about the way the world works and people work?**

**Rick Rosner:** Well I don't know about the US versus other places but the more we learn about the brain, the more it becomes a reasonable idea that it really isn't free will that you can account for everything that people do based on brain biology, based on people's pasts, based on the structure of the brain and on our evolutionary history, but our system of punishment for crimes is based on free will. That goes on acting is as if people make choices and then choose to do bad and that's not I mean that the window for mitigating punishment or avoiding punishment based on insanity, your background, that's a small window that not many cases I think to get you know successfully pass through that, that eye of the needle.

Though you could make the case for at least in general terms for almost anyone's bad acts. But that's not necessarily a tragedy of being mean to people for things that they're not responsible for. We hold people responsible for their decisions. Almost you know more than well over ninety percent of the time probably over 96% of the time in when they're they done criminal things.

We treat people as if their decisions have been more or less freely made and I know that's not a terrible thing, the whole as if the system is part of what goes into determinate decision making. Decision making that is not free, also reflects some extent one of the factors in making decisions about what to do is knowledge of our criminal system and the punishments that one might face for bad decisions.

So even though our decisions you can argue aren't at some basic level free, we wait one thing that helps keep people on the straight and narrow in a determinant way, is our system of punishment for crimes that's it. I mean there's a paradox there but it's one that we're used to and can work with. And when people I mean in the I've read plenty of science fiction set in the future where instead of facing punishment, evildoers just have their brains adjusted so they don't do evil anymore.

And that's a frustrating thing for readers somebody gets to do bad and then they get to avoid punishment. So even though our system is paradoxical holding people responsible for actions that we know more and more they're not you know that they're not free not to make, the idea of not holding people responsible is weird and not approved is not approved of at some kind of visceral level. We wouldn't like a future it will take a lot of getting used to a future in which people aren't punished for the crime but rather are adjusted to not recommit that's it.

[End of recorded material]

## **Ask A Genius 274 - Longer and Healthier**

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner**

**August 29, 2017**

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: We talk a lot about people living longer and healthier, sure that's good. What does this mean concretely?**

**Rick Rosner:** Well, what it means for a society is it takes a while for a longer life to roll out. Just because you don't get to see if anybody's going to be living to 110 or 120, until enough years have passed for people to reach that point. And so there's a delay like it's not all of a sudden, instantly everybody's going to be living to 120 because if you're 60 now or 70 now.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 275 - The Future for Kindness

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 30, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: So, this is for the future of, you wanted to talk about the future of kindness. What is our future of kindness, and what is your future of kindness?**

**Rick Rosner:** Well, alright so, the present and past of kindness is pretty much hinges on the golden rule. But you don't even, for every day acts of kindness, you don't even need to apply the logic of the golden rule. We kind of know what people want, from being around people forever, so kindness is generally, not being mean to people.

With possible exceptions being mean to people who, where it would improve their lives to be mean to them, like in an intervention. Where being mean to people where stopping them will stop them from hurting other people. And then you can extend that to other creatures, within reason. And you can extend to the products made by people that you don't want to just wreck stuff, if it would make people feel bad, unnecessarily.

Then there is more eustatic varieties of kindness, the different levels of charity. There is the saying, feed a man a fish you feed him for a day, teach him how to fish then you feed for a lifetime. So, it's kinder to do something that leads to long-term benefits. Under Judaism, it is kinder to give to a charity that you don't take credit for, maybe the people don't even realize they are given charity, because that can be demoralizing. But basically, everything boils down to just being nice to people.

The mid-future, will have the dilemmas of who has feelings as AI proliferates and we merge with AI. And, also problems of maintaining of sense of proportion, maybe purposefully losing a sense of proportion because say 80 years in the future there is some augmented humans who are 50 times smarter and more perceptive than natural humans.

[End of recorded material]



## Ask A Genius 276 - The Future for Kindness (2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 31, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** And under that system somebody could argue that those are the people that deserve all of our considerations because they are feeling things much more intensely with all of their added cognitive power. You want to maintain some kind of lack of proportion where the smartest beings don't get all of the kindness.

That we don't want to forget where we came from and where many humans will still be. The same way it is dooshy to be cruel to animals just because they are dumber than we are. Also, part of kindness will be figuring out what set ups for happiness, AI's or humans merged with AI's have and trying to fulfill those set-ups within reason.

And trying to figure out those set-ups themselves are reasonable. It still all boils down to being nice to thinking beings, but it will be tougher to sort out what thinking beings are, what they want, whether it's best that they want those things, you know so you have a robotic assistant that has been programmed to appear to be conscious with feelings and drives, but is basically not it is just simulating that stuff because maybe it is an easier problem in hardware and programming.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 277 - The Future for Kindness (3)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 1, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** But maybe that thing would be more effective with feelings, and maybe there is an argument to be made for sophisticated piece of machinery like that, that simulates feelings to have actual feelings. I don't know what that argument would be actually, why you would be arguing to turn an inanimate object into a thinking being with all the potential suffering and risks that might entail, and that doesn't seem necessarily seem like a great move. On the other hand, if you have a thing that is on the verge of thinking, but it exists in like

On the other hand, if you have a thing that is on the verge of thinking, but it exists in like equivalent brain damaged world because all of half-assed-ness that went into its construction, maybe it would be a mitzvah to make it fully conscious. There are going to be all sorts of arguments around who deserves kindness, consideration, legal rights, financial resources, and it all boils back down to having good models of what's happening in the brains or information processors of these various things.

My conservative buddy Lance, that's the thing people are resistant to because it is really tough, my buddy Lance last night, went back to the black box argument saying he is not interested in if people have racist thoughts, he is only interested in, because I was arguing that everybody is racist to a certain extent.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 277 - The Future for Kindness (3)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 1, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** But maybe that thing would be more effective with feelings, and maybe there is an argument to be made for sophisticated piece of machinery like that, that simulates feelings to have actual feelings. I don't know what that argument would be actually, why you would be arguing to turn an inanimate object into a thinking being with all the potential suffering and risks that might entail, and that doesn't seem necessarily seem like a great move. On the other hand, if you have a thing that is on the verge of thinking, but it exists in like

On the other hand, if you have a thing that is on the verge of thinking, but it exists in like equivalent brain damaged world because all of half-assed-ness that went into its construction, maybe it would be a mitzvah to make it fully conscious. There are going to be all sorts of arguments around who deserves kindness, consideration, legal rights, financial resources, and it all boils back down to having good models of what's happening in the brains or information processors of these various things.

My conservative buddy Lance, that's the thing people are resistant to because it is really tough, my buddy Lance last night, went back to the black box argument saying he is not interested in if people have racist thoughts, he is only interested in, because I was arguing that everybody is racist to a certain extent.

[End of recorded material]

## **Ask A Genius 279 - A-Atheist (1)**

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner**

**September 3, 2017**

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Well, we were just talking in another session about worldviews and limitations and knowledge; you're not an atheist, why?**

**Rick Rosner: I'm not an atheist?**

**Jacobsen: Yeah, why?**

**Rosner:** Alright, so, I'm not a full-on atheist. I would say that the full-on atheist believes the universe arises from random actions based on the principles of physics and proceeds via chance according to the laws of quantum physics and other applicable areas of physics like cosmology, general relativity, and just things that there's no one in charge and there's no creator, that it's just the principles and laws of physics. That's kind of been the default scientific point of view of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 280 - A-Atheist (2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 4, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** I have beliefs that don't entirely coincide with that view; it still comes from the same place from both, in math and science, and the rules of existence from which we get the laws of physics and the rules of existence don't preclude theistic type of things.

I believe that consciousness is not a mystical property bestowed by some nebulous, invisible, omnipotent being that we've been imbued or endowed with special magical fluid that animates our experience of the world. Instead, I believe that consciousness is a technical property of information being shared in the brain.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 281 - A-Atheist (3)

September 5, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** When information is being processed in a particular way you get consciousness and a confluence information is being shared among the various process and systems of the brain in such a way is to maximize the potential helpful contribution from each analytic system in the brain and from systems in the brain that help you retrieve relevant memories that efficient use of processing is consciousness.

That widespread sharing which is an efficient way to address novelty in one's moment to moment life feels like consciousness. This book that I keep bringing up, 'How emotions are made' by Lisa Barrett says that the brain is a predictor and a simulator and from moment to moment the brain sets us up to best predict what is going to happen and to take appropriate actions when simulating the outside the world and also our inside world.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 282 - A-Atheist (4)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 6, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** The brain when we're awake at least is... and even when we're not awake, being asleep is also a best bet type of deal where our brains have biological limitations. We can't be awake all the time, or maybe I am... even being asleep is a bet that it's safe to be asleep for a bunch of hours. We've set ourselves safely when sleeping because we have houses; people don't just sleep on the sidewalk but everything the brain does is betting, it's trying to come up with the best course of action and that means having a simulated version of the world within our awareness and having all parts of the brain participating in that stimulation, so that we can come up with the best course of action regardless of what happens over from moment to moment.

Anyway, so consciousness is just sophisticated information. So, anyway you're asking why I'm not a cold big bang, cold random Big Bang believer; so, there are two things that go into having more theistic beliefs. One is the consciousness is a property of information sharing, two is that the information within consciousness can be understood as forming it's a world of information that looks like the universe that has the same physics. With those two things you get kind of a theistic result because then you can argue by analogy from the universe to the brain and back again.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 283 - A-Atheist (5)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 7, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** There's information within consciousness, we experience it as the feeling of consciousness but that information should be character risible physically and mathematically; you should be able to model that information as interacting with itself in some kind of information space, which when applied to the brain it means you have the brain and it switches the hard way.

You have the kind of conscious experience that we have of the processes going on in the brain and then you have the math or the information space of the information being processed in the brain and if you then make the assumption, I guess that's a third ingredient that the universe is itself a map of the information in a vast information processing system or consciousness, then you have to argue by analogy that there has to be hardware to support that the existence of that information. You can't have the information in our consciousness without a brain being the hardware that contains and processes that information.

So, if the universe is an information space, then that implies hardware outside the universe that supports that information. It implies the existence of something outside the universe and in fact implies a very troublesome kind of hierarchy of some kind of hardware container for every information space so anything that exists, exists because of hardware outside the existence of that world. That's troubling because it implies like a big infinity of containers but that's the best I can do right now but it is theistic and implies powers beyond and outside the world we live in.

[End of recorded material]



## Ask A Genius 284 - A-Atheist (6)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 8, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** What if the universe is its own container somehow?

**Rick Rosner:** Well, I don't know. I mean that's a possibility. I don't know how that would work or it's a possibility that you don't need infinities and somehow the hierarchy of containers can feedback around so that you don't need an infinity of containers.

It becomes like an Escher's one-hand drawing the other which is two hands drawing each other and you could imagine some kind of network of container hardware world which somehow loop around, in the end, don't require an infinite number of frames but that sounds just as goofy is that the idea of an infinity frames or you might be able to argue that the infinity is moot because it is it's impossible to get at.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 285 - A-Atheist (7)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 9, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** We're in the universe; good luck getting to the hardware that contains the information that the universe consists of and even more good luck as it'll be even tougher to get to the container of that information, the hardware world that contains our information world.

At some point it just all kind of becomes irrelevant to the point of not being even arguable for because it's so remote and inaccessible from the world we live in. There's also the possibility that the idea that it could be wrong that the universe consists of information, it seems unlikely to me because information is pretty much the simplest thing that can be.

When you define information as the choice or the specific value that exists in a system of where you have a finite number of choices, in other words in a system where something can be on or off or can have the value of zero or one.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 286 - Apocalypse Now, For You (1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 10, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** There could be a disruption index which is a framework for looking at the lives of generations of people. And kind of gauging how much disruption they have in their actual physical lives, their physical conditions and also in their world views and you know it's always the apocalypse for someone.

Somebody's some pose somewhere on earth some group of people is always I mean not every single minute but from year to year a decade to decade, some group of people is always getting loop shit kicked out for the you know getting all their unsocial underpinnings kicked out from under German Jews, European Jews, in the 1920s. Well assimilated feeling that they were part of the life of the country and then within a decade having everything pulled out from under them.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 287 - Apocalypse Now, For You (2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 11, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** And six million of them just slaughtered and the rest just scattered just kind of forced out of their countries. Got right, you know any place you have genocide you to go cross, you know all the genocidal wars across Africa you know people who were established and felt at home in their countries and in other countries who have killed and expelled them. Lebanon was a beautiful paradise on earth until the 70s and then it fell apart. Syria was probably not the most pleasant country but it was a functioning country and now it's deep in civil wars hell on earth. There was scary there was well I don't know; I mean there was Iraq was I don't know if you can call it stable they have had a bunch of wars against Iran. It was under you know a cruel dictator who've killed possibly tens of thousands of his own people on average per year but still kind of had a stable structure until we came in and just turn Iraq into a close to a failed state.

So nobody in the words of Monty Python nobody expects or suspects the Spanish Inquisition, nobody in these countries expected to have their other you know within America we're chauvinistic, we tend to think of other countries especially in certain parts of the world like Africa and Mideast, as just being chaotic hell. But really if you look at the country's most of them are stable for long periods of time and then the chaos pops up here and there and takes out entire nations that has been functioning if not well at least with some degree of stability for periods of years and decades before everything falls apart.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 288 - Apocalypse Now, For You (3)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 12, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** And you know we in America didn't expect our political system to get through to have the to be undergoing the insults it's currently undergoing. And similarly, we don't expect for the future to kick our asses, but it is, but there is the disruption, the disruptions that will be going on over the next three centuries or five centuries. Are going to be more severe than anything in previous years in human history, if it's the end of the world not in a terrible way that will leave just the smoking dead landscape, but in a way that your human life as we've noted as humans have lived it for tens of thousands of years, will be ridiculously transformed.

And the disruption index you could apply to the past and to the future to kind of get a handle on what we're facing. And it's something we should be looking at because instead of, because no matter what we do we're gonna be surprised by the changes. But we could if we start thinking about them now we could be a little less surprised. And we can take advantage of people who have a better feel for the future obviously we'll do better in the future.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 289 - Apocalypse Now, For You (4)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 13, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: But most people won't be ready and are not and will not be willing to be ready for rapid change.**

**Rick Rosner:** What people can do, faced with the future people can do what they've always done, which is die, everybody has died up to now. Now that the future offers some people the chance not to go longer and longer without dying but when faced with disruption, people who have done what else can you do? You could feel confused, you can get older and older or get killed by the disruption. If you don't get killed by the disruption, you still just get older and older until you die. And so I mean and then things will proceed you know generations pass away and new generations have a different set of living conditions that they get used to, but it seems reasonable to fight confusion, to fight, to get ready for disruption, to get ready to embrace opportunities not to die, by anticipating the future. That's it.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 290 - Innovations in the Future

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 14, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

### Scott Douglas Jacobsen: What about innovations in the future?

**Rick Rosner:** I have not been doing a lot of thinking about this, I've kind of blindly accepted that future innovation will be done by the automated people are working in combination with AI or by AI itself. The most steps forward, you know, beginning ten, twenty, thirty years from now are going to be in serious combination with AI or by AI on its own. But thinking further about it, and having...having been in the art model off and on, since I was twenty-four so more than thirty years I have been working a bunch of places including the art, you know, you get good art for the most work done from places that are art schools, like Art Centre Pasadena or Cal Art or SVA New York or the New York (inaudible) and if the art is done by none art students at none art colleges like the University of Colorado in New Mexico, you know, schools that don't specialize in art, that's a much lower level of skills and artistic insight so, I can imagine that, you know, what innovation isn't done in AI for humans the concerns with AI's will be kind of that level kind of, you know, make human innovation looks kind of crappier in relative to what the powerful technology can do so, there will be, though crappier often, it can be fun. So, you've got, you'll have...innovation will have several flavours, probably many more flavours than that, but off the top of my head there will be pure AI innovations which, you know, takes a while to come. Because AI is helpless at this point without being human directed. You will have AI that real innovations being done by augmented humans, you will have innovations by defiant human craft people, people who don't like the coming status quo of everything being mediated through AI and who have diligently determined or developed the practice their craft to be able to continue with the human arts of creation without resorting to AI. This is a kind of what my buddy Lance, a Sculpture and Painter does, he sticks to old forms, the ancient Greek sculptural methods, renaissance painting methods and I tell Lance...at least he paints paternal themes, you know, deep metaphysical themes and, you know, like Lance, he just paints like modern people (inaudible) modern way, like people talking on their cell phones in cars or they are texting while driving, and he refuses to give in to modernity and so, you will have some innovation, some creativity coming from defiant defenders of human craft and art, and then you will have the casual, you know, creators of ridiculousness of t-shirt themes and memes done by, you know, regular people joking around, so that's it.

The most steps forward, you know, beginning ten, twenty, thirty years from now are going to be in serious combination with AI or by AI on its own. But thinking further about it, and having...having been in the art model off and on, since I was twenty-four so more than thirty years I have been working a bunch of places including the art, you know, you get good art for the most work done from places that are art schools, like Art Centre Pasadena or Cal Art or SVA New York or the New York (inaudible) and if the art is done by none art students at none art colleges like the University of Colorado in New Mexico, you know, schools that don't specialize in art, that's a much lower level of skills and artistic insight so, I can imagine that, you know, what innovation isn't done in AI for humans the concerns with AI's will be kind of that level

kind of, you know, make human innovation looks kind of crappier in relative to what the powerful technology can do so, there will be, though crappier often, it can be fun. So, you've got, you'll have...innovation will have several flavors, probably many more flavors than that, but off the top of my head, there will be pure AI innovations which, you know, takes a while to come. Because AI is helpless at this point without being human-directed. You will have AI that real innovations being done by augmented humans, you will have innovations by defiant human craft people, people who don't like the coming status quo of everything being mediated through AI and who have diligently determined or developed the practice their craft to be able to continue with the human arts of creation without resorting to AI. This is a kind of what my buddy Lance, a Sculpture and Painter does, he sticks to old forms, the ancient Greek sculptural methods, renaissance painting methods and I tell Lance...at least he paints paternal themes, you know, deep metaphysical themes and, you know, like Lance, he just paints like modern people (inaudible) modern way, like people talking on their cell phones in cars or they are texting while driving, and he refuses to give in to modernity and so, you will have some innovation, some creativity coming from defiant defenders of human craft and art, and then you will have the casual, you know, creators of ridiculousness of t-shirt themes and memes done by, you know, regular people joking around, so that's it.

[End of recorded material]



# Ask A Genius 291 - Universal Basic Income (1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 15, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** What're your thoughts on a universal basic income, a basic income or a negative interest tax or something?

**Rick Rosner:** You're talking about the idea that Finland is experimenting with which is just giving everybody kind of a basic really subsistence level wage even if they're not working.

**Jacobsen:** Well, just one quick thing; its Kenya, Finland, Switzerland, and the Netherlands.

**Rosner:** Okay, I don't think any of those, I don't know. You probably know better. I don't think any of those countries is doing it for everybody. I think they're just experimenting with it.

**Jacobsen:** Four cities in the Netherlands; the Swiss government vote on a referendum that would give citizens as much as 2,623 dollars per month.

**Rosner:** Now, is that happening? Has it been implemented yet?

**Jacobsen:** On June 5<sup>th</sup> they voted on the referendum, so it's probably.

**Rosner:** So, it hasn't started yet? You're saying that people are basically going to get 31 grand a year in American dollars the equivalent just for being a Swiss citizen?

**Jacobsen:** I guess so.

**Rosner:** Yes, well we have systems like this in America for certain populations. You live in Alaska, you get money every year for just being an Alaskan from I believe the sale of oil. You participate in the economic life of the state, it sells a lot of oil and you get money. If you belong to certain Native American tribes, you participate in the life of the tribe, you get the cut of casino profits if your tribe runs a casino. So, this stuff happens even in America even though red-blooded conservative Americans say this is socialism. But anyway, 10% of their population, they're trying.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 292 - Universal Basic Income (2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 16, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** Which country?

**Rosner:** Finland.

**Jacobsen:** 550-year-old monthly wage to ten thousand working adults.

**Rosner:** Okay, so ten thousand people, not 10% of the population?

**Jacobsen:** No.

**Rosner:** So, that works out to be like 7200 bucks a year which isn't enough to live on but certainly helpful. Anyway, this thing is popping up now I believe because of job dislocation and loss to the increasing technology.

We've always had since the Industrial Revolution, we've had job loss and obsolescence due to technology where the U.S used to be a majority agricultural country for most people who are working or working on farm. And now it's down to like 2% due to technology; that was a 110 - 120 years ago. Those of the people who were pushed off the farms were able to find other areas to work in and but now as automation takes over more and more areas of work it becomes tougher and tougher for people to find areas of work that aren't being automated and right now actually America has pretty close to full employment. So, job losses due to automation or not [04:34] and lot of people have the feeling that it's super imminent. What else are you going to do when there isn't enough work for everybody?

**Jacobsen:** Alright, we checked out Korea; it has the highest ratio of humans to robots in terms of workers.

**Rosner:** What do you mean? Highest ratio of robots to humans?

**Jacobsen:** Yes.

**Rosner:** And how messed up are they because of that?

**Jacobsen:** They seem like a clean running culture.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 293 - Universal Basic Income (3)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 17, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** I consider the Trump-Clinton election like the first AI election; first election where automation and computerization and robots really helps determine the lot of the issues. We're behind a lot of the issues in the elections where each side is kind of promising something for the people who have lost their jobs due to the disappearance of traditional industrial jobs in America. And it comes in the Trump... we're going to bring back coal, we're going to bring factories back, Hillary to a certain extent as we're going to train everybody for new modern jobs. Nobody got anything to gain by saying this thing. It would take a really crazy politician to say, "In terms of some areas of employment, we're just fucked because robots are cheaper".

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** When we look at like China has .36 robots per 100 workers, global average is .66 robots for 100 workers, United States has 1.64 robots per 100 workers, Germany has 2.92, Japan 3.4 per 100, Korea has 4.78 robots per 100 workers which is substantial.

**Rosner:** That's a little deceptive, all those stats and how many workers does each of those robots replace? You've got robot productivity versus human productivity. There might be 20 in Korea there may be 25 workers or so for every robot, but if every robot is on average doing a job that previously required three people then the ratio goes from four robots per 100 to 12 human equivalent jobs per 100 people still working in jobs.

**Jacobsen:** Yes, and people's jobs had become more casual.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 294 - Universal Basic Income (4)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 18, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** So, the guaranteed minimum income is one way to do things, another way to do things is to pay people for things that perhaps people haven't been paid for in the past like expressing consumer preferences; people get paid very little for that.

Participating in social media; businesses and the economy benefit from people's part to a certain extent with people's participation in social media. It tells businesses what people like and don't like and what the life of the country is like.

It's exploitable commercial, so it's not unreasonable that people should perhaps get paid for that kind of stuff but that's not only like a baby step away from this guaranteed minimum income because you're paying people for doing stuff they do anyway and then really doesn't directly produce anything.

There's another way to go which is don't pay anybody, let people just get really poor and scramble to survive and maybe that will convince people either to do choir training or figure out how to live in some kind of black or gray market economy or maybe most dire level just has few more kids but nobody on the conservative side.

And it would be conservatives it would be most likely that all guaranteed minimum income is communist socialist scheme to weaken America, to destroy America.

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Is it really that dumb? [Laughing]**

**Rosner:** Oh yeah. I have a very smart friend who would argue that I'm almost positive.

**Jacobsen: Does he really believe it though?**

**Rosner:** He believes there's a lot of things that are trying to destroy America.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 295 - Universal Basic Income (5)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 19, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** There have been arguments for some of these things. Or another thing could happen is if you don't get people the guaranteed minimum income, then they get poor and then it's a business opportunity for companies to figure out how to make things extra cheap for extra poor people.

It becomes an exploitable niche and its part of capitalism, like you go to the 99-cent store; I don't know if you have one in Canada, but the dollar store where everything is a dollar or less; they have everything you could buy a hammer, a mop, flashlight, DVDs, I don't know...

I haven't seen a baby carriage there, fuck... but not out of the realm of possibility. You can get just about everything you need for everyday life at the dollar store because somebody figured out a way to make a really crappy version of something and they charge a dollar for it even if it's some things normally ten bucks or 12 bucks or 30 bucks, here's the crappy version and you'll get the dollars to super sucky but it'll do what it's supposed to do maybe not long but there you go.

And it'll become even more possible to do that with further automation, so I think the future will offer at least in America some combination of them. Some places have to set up systems that provide some kind of welfare, people who have a hard time finding employment, conservatives will try to limit that. People will pursue the black and the gray market, underground economies of people will find themselves able to get by buying really crappy stuff living kind of lives of the Teeter on the edge of disaster but at the same time or perhaps not as miserable as people a 100 years ago because streaming video and other freaking cheap food that tastes terrible as opposed to depression food which was in some instances made intentionally bland and barely edible to discourage people from eating too much because food was unaffordable.

So, it'll be a combination of those things and the U.S being a semi-Yahoo country [laughing].

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** [Laughing].

**Rosner:** A sentence will be crueler in its approaches to automation-based job loss, economic dislocation, some fancy-pants liberal countries like Finland.

**Jacobsen:** You're describing the end of the Roman Empire basically.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 296 - Universal Basic Income (6)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 20, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** There have been arguments for some of these things. Or another thing could happen is if you don't get people the guaranteed minimum income, then they get poor and then it's a business opportunity for companies to figure out how to make things extra cheap for extra poor people.

It becomes an exploitable niche and its part of capitalism, like you go to the 99-cent store; I don't know if you have one in Canada, but the dollar store where everything is a dollar or less; they have everything you could buy a hammer, a mop, flashlight, DVDs, I don't know...

I haven't seen a baby carriage there, fuck... but not out of the realm of possibility. You can get just about everything you need for everyday life at the dollar store because somebody figured out a way to make a really crappy version of something and they charge a dollar for it even if it's some things normally ten bucks or 12 bucks or 30 bucks, here's the crappy version and you'll get the dollars to super sucky but it'll do what it's supposed to do maybe not long but there you go.

And it'll become even more possible to do that with further automation, so I think the future will offer at least in America some combination of them. Some places have to set up systems that provide some kind of welfare, people who have a hard time finding employment, conservatives will try to limit that. People will pursue the black and the gray market, underground economies of people will find themselves able to get by buying really crappy stuff living kind of lives of the Teeter on the edge of disaster but at the same time or perhaps not as miserable as people a 100 years ago because streaming video and other freaking cheap food that tastes terrible as opposed to depression food which was in some instances made intentionally bland and barely edible to discourage people from eating too much because food was unaffordable.

So, it'll be a combination of those things and the U.S being a semi-Yahoo country [laughing].

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** [Laughing].

**Rosner:** A sentence will be crueler in its approaches to automation-based job loss, economic dislocation, some fancy-pants liberal countries like Finland.

**Jacobsen:** You're describing the end of the Roman Empire basically.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 297 - Universal Basic Income (7)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 21, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** Let me sum up, just let me say this. Guaranteed minimum wage is one tool on the Swiss army knife of addressing automation based economic dislocation.

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** Okay.

**Rosner:** It's something that should always be kept in mind but is a small way of addressing and for me in America, I don't have to worry about the politicians leaning on that solution too hard because the Conservatives won't let that happen.

**Jacobsen:** Because that's socialism in the same way climate change is the liberal hope.

**Rosner:** Not a liberal hope, it's Chinese hopes.

**Jacobsen:** [laughing] well, liberal and Chinese hopes.

**Rosner:** Okay, you're saying it's the end of the Roman Empire and that's extreme assistance, it's always been the end of America, it's always the apocalypse for someone. I do think when you look at American behavior there are enough people in America right now who to some extent are behaving like dicks to the point where you could argue that we are no longer as good a country as we like to think we are. Proud Americans and I still am a proud American; like to think that we are a force for good in the world, but when you look at the level of dickishness that affects our culture and our daily lives and our politics there's argument to be made that we're just not as good as people as we used to be.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 298 - Universal Basic Income (8)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 22, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: What's the source of this?**

**Rosner:** You mean what makes me say that? Well, you go on social media, particularly Twitter and it's a festival of rancor and bullying and ridicule and non-conciliatory speech. Then you go out in your car; just in LA or in a lot of cities and everybody is driving like a selfish dick wad often because they can't bring themselves to get off...driving is people who just stop several car lengths short of where they should stop it at stop signs or when encountering a line of traffic because they just kind of are approximately barely paying attention to what's going on in their driving environment.

So, they just kind of stop kind of over roughly, they know something's coming up and don't stop well behind where they should and just start looking at their phone and just sit there even when traffic starts moving again. It's particularly annoying at traffic signals that are triggered by pulling up on the soft bar or the magnetic trigger is that says, "Oh, there's somebody here who wants to trip left, who wants the light to change and the car that is waiting for light to change is 20 feet beyond the point where they could get the light to change and so it just doesn't you're stuck with them." That's just one flavor of dickishness but the level of driving dickishness is it steadily increases, you hear about countries where almost all drivers are dicks; being a total dick is necessary for driving in that country like Italy is known for that. But that's from the '60s and '70s where and it's based on super aggressive driving in your tiny little four feet by eight feet Fiat, but now in America dickishness, while driving takes the form of not driving on roads.

And then you look at politicians where like Mitch McConnell, one of the most dick-ish politicians currently in power decides that you can get away with the Supreme Court, particularly since Supreme Court justices may not have to die very much anymore because medicine is going to get better and better. I don't know how sophisticated his thinking is about that but people appointed the Supreme Court now could still be serving in 2016 or 2017, said she is in her 50s could as medicine improves he could keep working to age a 100 if the advances in medicine that are supposed to be coming actually come and you can bet if Kennedy who's rumored to be retiring retires that the appointee Trump's next nominee will be no older than in his early 50s after Trump can find a reliably conservative nominee who's in his or her late 40s or mid-40s, he'll nominate the hell out of that person and get somebody who's still going to be on the court in 2050s and 60s at the very least.

So McConnel says we can't let position on the court go to the person who under normal conditions would be nominated for it by Obama and we have to come up with some bullshit to deny that nomination and that's just craven and it's anti-democratic and I think it's anti-American and that dickishness just pervades government at state national levels right now.

[End of recorded material]



## Ask A Genius 299 - Edenbargain (1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 23, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** We talked about the Edenbargain, what do you mean by that?

**Rick Rosner:** I don't know if anybody else has ever used the term. I kind of made it up, because I think our current situation has parallels with the Garden of Eden. Where, you know, God set a place for humans at his table. And said all you have to do is to have paradise is not to acquire knowledge. And you know, things were nice there. There was, I think even, I don't think you know, I think according to the Bible, people in the Garden of Eden, Adam and Eve hadn't succumbed to the snake's knowledge, they might have had immortality you know. They had no shame, they could walk around naked and nobody was freaked out. They had all of the fruits of paradise except for apples I guess. But anyway, they had it nice, and all they had to do to keep was to stay dumb, but they didn't. So, they got kicked out of the Garden of Eden.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 300 - Edenbargain (2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 24, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** You mean this as a metaphor, just to clarify?

**Rick Rosner:** Yeah. And to put it in you know less religious terms, you could say instead of God setting a place at his table, you could say that evolution has set a place for us at its table that we are very adapted, very competent, you know we have dominion over the world. Which we shouldn't have, you could argue that we shouldn't have as much dominion as we do, because we are messing up a lot of stuff. But we, you know, we are the king shits of the planet right now. Thanks to our evolved skills. Also thanks to our evolved skills we are about to descramble or completely understand how the brain works, how consciousness works, and incidentally how the body works. Which will eventually lead to types of immortality. But it also means that we will be kicked out of our evolved natural emperorsip of the world. You know we have things pretty nice, we can do what we want in the world, we have lives full of pleasures, entertainment, and good food and good sex, if we are lucky enough to live in a rich country and not a horrible situation. Where we enjoy the fruits of dominion. We like what we like. We have definite likes that we have evolved as evolved creatures, that evolution wants us or driven us to certain types of food helped us survive during that period of which we evolved. We like sex because sex carries on the species. There is a lot of stuff that we have evolved to like, and we live in a world that has a lot of that stuff and we have the skill to make more of that stuff. But we are about to lay ourselves bare.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 301 - Edenbargain (3)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 25, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** We are about to deconstruct ourselves and completely understand how we are made, how we work, and we are about to have dominion over ourselves and our drives. So, we are acquiring knowledge and we are getting kicked out of natural paradise.

We are going to be on our own because we will be for the first time in charge of what we think, how we think, what we feel, we will determine our drives. And we have to, living as a human, what we do as humans, to being a choice, that we will be able to live in a whole bunch of other ways that are more self-determined.

And along with that goes all sorts of social disruption, disenchantment, both with our human forms and the forms that are to come as we work through the various kinks in those forms. We will know a lot, and in knowing a lot about ourselves we will, we have talked about this before, we will see how rinky-dink and little we really are. Even though we have the gift of consciousness.

On the other hand, along with this knowledge will be conscious is the best you can do, it is the king shit of information processing. And all of the rinky-dink we have as conscious beings, are shared with, we can assume, trillions of other conscious species or sets of entities across the universe.

The consciousness is in all its magical glory and sad limitations is how information is best processed. And maybe we will be able to punch through the consciousness as we understand it to higher levels of information processing. And more desolated forms of existence. But I can't kind of doubt it. I think that even the fanciest future forms of information processing will still be forms of consciousness. The end.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 302 – Sensory Systems and Consciousness (1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
September 26, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** Off tape in the past, we've talked about sensory apparatuses, which is indicating you know consciousness. What do you mean by that?

**Rick Rosner:** Well all right before we get to that let's talk about the eyes. People have always been well the eyes are a big deal to people, you know the eyes were to all of history what the but is now just a focus of human interest. And you know they're the windows to the soul, t it's often the key you know for an actor that you know whether you know you can people think they can tell whether somebody's smart or not by looking telling the truth or not looking into their eyes, there's just a lot of information there. And they're used by both of them, by evolutionists and creationists to make their points. Creationists argue that the eyes are so perfect that they had to be created, they couldn't have evolved. And then evolutionists are like look how many freaking times throughout the history of evolution that eyes have evolved? And I mean they evolved like crazy I don't know how much different along how many different lineages and how many different forms eyes have evolved but it has to be my own pushing a dozen? Where eyes are there's an easy path, an easy evolutionary path to eyes in every step along the way from having no eyes whatsoever to having eyes is helpful to the organism that's taking each step. You know sensitivity to light some kind of eye spot but really that does nothing lens or anything it just it feels the intensity of light that's helpful and then every little incremental improvement is helpful to the organism, that has that incremental you know advantage over others of its type.

And apparently based on the history of evolution there is there are mutations that allow this to happen just eyes are I don't think we can call the easy evolve but they are a frequent evolve unlike say wheels, wheels almost never evolve. And even though you can imagine that a wheeled organism you know might have significant advantages in certain environments or not who knows. But there's an - I'd like to use eyes and other sensory apparatus to just make the quick case for technical consciousness.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 303 – Sensory Systems and Consciousness (2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
September 27, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** And it's not the best argument but it's you know just a little dinky argument that eyes are such an efficient funnel of outside information into the brain, they take what's going on the outside and accumulate you know all this information via photons and then you have efficient processors, it's a super smooth flow of visual information from the outside to the inside.

Ditto for most of our senses and foremost of our lives you know ears are pretty smooth and you could argue that, that the hearing is a much more kind of it's a harder to construct kind of canyon. You can imagine that might be harder to construct a world of sound than a world of light because light you know it comes in discrete photon packages. There's a lot of you know that you have to process the patterns formed by these photons but the photons themselves are you know pretty sharply, informationally sharp and then but hearing you know processing sound, I don't know well involves stage involve different issues and they're in there aren't there aren't you know sound particles.

You have to take vibrations which might be Messier and turned them into signals but any in each case I you get really smooth processing from the outside to you're to your experience. And I believe that argues for if eyes and ears are so slick, then you know it argues for a similar slickness, as a consequence of hundreds of millions of years of evolution for our understanding of visual and auditory information. And as a further step our conscious understanding of it.

You know you first you've got the outside information then you have the prod then you have the receiving of that the processing of it in such a way that it delivers a reasonably accurate picture of the world, and you can still have all three of those steps without having consciousness. You know you can have an electric eye that still needs those same kind of signals it's not conscious, but the smoothness of every step leading up to consciousness argues that consciousness is itself a slick and mechanical property of information processing in the little brain.

So I guess it' proof through slickness but the various steps in information processing all work really nicely, which argues for consciousness being a further really nice, highly evolved, technically slick, a further step of the processes sensory and information processes.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 304 – Science Faction and Fiction (1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 28, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** All right, so what isn't going to happen in science fiction. So we're not all going to Mars well people may colonize Mars. That's a multi-century project to terraform Mars and not that many people are going live on to go on trips to explore for Alpha Centauri, which is four light years away which you know so getting there will take 20, 30, 40 years. Even if the holding (unclear 00:41) but by the time it takes to colonize Mars or the 2000 expedition of the Centauri the earth is going to be wildly transforming. So, which is as we were saying earlier just not captured by much science fiction where science fiction goes things for a sense of wonder and scale. You know exciting there's a ones of the things are superheroes scales in some science fiction and there are science fiction is one of the might be the most, might be the genre as in the most active in terms of having three short stories. Which you could explore a single idea or single feeling. So, it takes advantages short form but the future is not short form.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 305 – Science Faction and Fiction (2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 29, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** One of the things going on that are amenable to short stories or the inadequately captured. I mean aren't adequately capture the grand scale transformation have life in the context of 200 years. The cyberpunk which started in the 80's flourished in the 90's is a captured of what life is starting to resemble now. Not only now is a lot of cyber, there is a lot of the sensibility being into movies as part of our vocabulary. But as I said we don't yet have a vocabulary of the dismantling of consciousness. We have metaphors for it child ads from the 50<sup>th</sup> but the other (unclear 3:46) I kind of remember it well but it kind of present the idea of this dismantling of humanity. Once it has reached a certain level of development. And it's no longer needed now is the next level has arisen. There is another story from the 50's is the nine million names of gods which were the purpose of humanity is to come up with all possible names of God and once we've done that go out of existence. But I nobody that I've seen as weakens out of the normal human existence or the long-stated into the weirdness that we're going to run into. Between 50 you know starting 20, 30 years from the next few centuries. Okay, I don't sure there are short stories that have tried to capture the narrative point of view of the consciousness distributed across three or four or five people.

But not well you can see that you have a shared consciousness. That means the way it plays out narratively is a bunch of his five different voices playing out in the single awareness movie inside out. Which you have five characters each embodying an emotion of one person. So I assume over the next 10 or 20 years we'll begin to develop a vocabulary of alternate forms of consciousness that will anticipate some of the changes that are coming. But not a lot of no! Not a lot of science fiction is doing that right now there you go.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 306 – Los Angeles Collapse

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

September 30, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** I wanted to talk about the collapse of Los Angeles. What's going on?

**Rick Rosner:** Well, I know all the stupid climate change deniers can say you know and talk about there is a difference between weather and climate which means there's a difference between. Specific random weather events and the overall climate but they usually make that argument like, like about Harvey, you know Harvey could have happened any time but Harvey really couldn't have happened at any time because Harvey is a product of well random chance plus the Gulf of Mexico being the temperature of a frickin bathtub and the hotter the water the more the water can be sucked up into the atmosphere to be dumped on land by a hurricane or other storm so the specific storm Harvey is a random occurrence that could have happened in any year but the amount of water dumped on Texas, some number of trillions of gallons of water is in part due to actual written global warming undeniably so unless you're an idiot for.

In L.A. this week in the valleys it's been like one hundred and ten every day. When I go out I, being unemployed I usually tweet all day and then I go to the gym at night and when I go to the gym it's been between ninety-five and ninety-nine degrees at eight to ten o'clock at night which is just brutal and yeah you could argue well that's just the heat wave and it could have happened any year but it's going to happen more often under the climate change regime. I found an app a few years ago where you can click on all the cities or many of the cities in the world to see how much the average temperature is already gone up over historical averages in the modern era and for most cities it's like four degrees and that's not all climate change just some of it is you know there's a lot of concrete that creates, that traps more heat, asphalt you know but it's an undeniable increase which leads me to the conclusion that Los Angeles will sometime in the next fifty years collapse.

[End of recorded material]



# Ask A Genius 307 – Constructivist and Essentialist Consciousness (1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
October 1, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** We're talking about the constructivist form of thought versus the essentialist form of thought; both are theories to describe the general structure in there for the outcome of human thought. What are your own thoughts on this based on based on the conversation you had?

**Rick Rosner:** First off, what is the background? Which is you know a month or two ago I read a book, *How Emotions are Made* by Lisa Feldman Barrett, which, she's a neuroscientist, and she seems to - she went crazy with the book. She got has like three hundred sources.

She seems to know the state of neuroscience with regard to how thoughts are formed, which still isn't saying that we know a lot because I mean we know a gazillion times more than we knew ten or twenty years ago, but it's still an incomplete kind of thing.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 308 – Constructivist and Essentialist Consciousness (2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
October 2, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** But it looks like products of mental information processing of cognition are expressed or are constituted by patterns of neurons firing which is the constructivist point of view or that there's not like a particular node for everything that you think or every particular you know ability you have or every emotion you have the just turns on or off that it's instead of that you know mental products of any degree of sophistication are constituted by the simultaneous or near simultaneous firing of groups of neurons with each neuron being able to participate in a number of different groups, so it's not the individual neurons turning on and off.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 309 – Constructivist and Essentialist Consciousness (3)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
October 3, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** So, its groups of you know big ass groups of neurons in complicated patterns of connectivity, somebody did some kind of study on the patterns of such kind of activity and discover that those patterns were best expressed in like eleven dimensional space, which is a goofy idea or a goofy way to say that the patterns of connectivity are widely varied that if you looked at every club say that a neuron belong to they would be a bunch of really different clubs you know there'd be a furry club and there'd be aerial acrobatics club and there'd be a fungus toenails club because they'd be all over the place and that it's only in combination that you get sophisticated mental products, thoughts, emotions.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 310 – Constructivist and Essentialist Consciousness (4)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
October 4, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** So, its groups of you know big ass groups of neurons in complicated patterns of connectivity, somebody did some kind of study on the patterns of such kind of activity and discover that those patterns were best expressed in like eleven dimensional space, which is a goofy idea or a goofy way to say that the patterns of connectivity are widely varied that if you looked at every club say that a neuron belong to they would be a bunch of really different clubs you know there'd be a furry club and there'd be aerial acrobatics club and there'd be a fungus toenails club because they'd be all over the place and that it's only in combination that you get sophisticated mental products, thoughts, emotions.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 311 – Constructivist and Essentialist Consciousness (5)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
October 5, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** Language is your brain picking out the right words for a situation or formulating a sentence and this whole thing is this constructivist versus the essentialist, the essentialist is that you run it just as a lot of plug-in modules that can be turned on and off. There's the mad module; there's the melancholy module; there's the module for the concept or the word orange and those things just get flipped on or off.

That seems like a more primitive an idea of how thought works and one that is seems to be being contradicted increasingly the more we find out so this has implications for our theory informational cosmology, which I've been thinking of it in an essentialist way that if the state of the universe if we have a little universe and are based on if we each have a little universe or informational universe based on the information being processed in our heads and if the wider universe is processing things in a conscious way that each thought requires its own spatial set up and for a thought to change for you to go from thinking one thing to thinking another like you're driving down the street and you're thinking about dinner and then some a hole like cut you off in traffic your thinking is going to change almost entirely.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 312 – Constructivist and Essentialist Consciousness (6)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
October 6, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** We've thought that this requires an entire reshuffling of the contents of the universe. That the current active universe, all its contents are pushed to the side and then other parts of the universe that have been sitting on the sidelines rotate in to constitute the new thought, and so it means then in the wider universe if the universe is actually thinking what I thought might take twenty or thirty or fifty billion years for the action of the universe to play out for galaxies and then for stars to form and for them to go through their life cycles and then for the galaxies to burn out and then to fall away to be replaced by new active galaxies expressing a new thought.

But that's an essentialist structure that you have these parts of the universe that embodied the thought and then they have to each be shunted aside for the new parts of the new thought. But under a constructivist construction, the various parts of the universe don't individually, like each galaxy or each star or whatever, embody some module that is a self-contained representation or expression or whatever of a concept or an emotion or whatever you want but the contents of the by-products of information processing are manifested in combinations of neurons or stellar galactic structures for flying that metaphor of the universe as a whole.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 313 – Constructivist and Essentialist Consciousness (7)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
October 7, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** So you don't have to replace the entire active universe with a whole other active universe to change your mind to have a new thought instead most of the universe can hang around and just be lit up in a different pattern and yeah you'll have a long-term changes to the structure of the universe if there are the aspects of the universe that just aren't used much those or don't interact much those are going to, relative to the rest of the universe again are going to collapse and be pushed to the side.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 314 – Constructivist and Essentialist Consciousness (8)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
October 8, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** But it's in terms of how much of that happens per thought it's going to be much less than in an essentialist universe because the constructivist universe can handle more than one thought with its current structure, which means that perhaps the time scale for thoughts versus the apparent age of the universe. you can cram in a bunch of thoughts within the apparent age of the universe just based on different parts of the universe lighting up so the time scale of thought if the universe is thinking is knocked down from say forty billion years per thought to I don't know, four billion years per thought you know, a billion years. I don't know it's knocked way down because you can I don't know a hundred million years because the existing structure can ninety-nine percent handle changes of thought because it's what parts of it are lighting up in an existing flexible and changing structure rather than the whole structure having to be replaced.

Maybe, you can cram in a bunch of thoughts within the apparent age of the universe just based on different parts of the universe lighting up so the time scale of thought if the universe is thinking is knocked down from say forty billion years per thought to I don't know, four billion years per thought you know, a billion years. I don't know it's knocked way down because you can I don't know a hundred million years because the existing structure can ninety-nine percent handle changes of thought because it's what parts of it are lighting up in an existing flexible and changing structure rather than the whole structure has to be replaced.

[End of recorded material]



# Ask A Genius 315 – Markets, Mothers, and Climate Change (1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
October 9, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** We were talking off tape about housing markets, your mother in law, and climate change.

**Rick Rosner:** Yeah sorry, my wife is helping her mom sell her house, to pay for her care in senior living. Which means the mortgages are paid off and everything there will be a chunk of capital that needs to be invested... to pay for her mom's care for the rest of her life. One of the possibilities we are looking at is... buying a duplex or something in L.A. Getting the rent from the duplex to help pay for Carol's mom.

I have started to be a little scared about buying L.A real estate, even though we are in the middle of a housing shortage. Because... I don't know how long L.A will be an attractive city. My wife and I are in our 50's. So we may end up owning the investment property 20 years from now when we are old and retired and... I don't know if L.A will still be a cool city to live in 20 years from now. Because of congestion and because of climate change where... I know that there are... you can't tell on a day to day basis, you can't tell the difference between statistical fluctuation and temperature, and long-term changes in overall climate. But this summer has been brutal, it was like 106 today.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 316 – Markets, Mothers, and Climate Change (2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

October 10, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** Same yesterday. A couple of weeks ago it was up over 110 for a few days. Yeah statistically you might expect to get days like that every few years, but... if it is an every few year thing. The most famous freeway in L.A is probably the 405. I believe it is six lanes in each direction now.

You just... you can't add any more lanes. Adding more lanes, by the time you add the lane; because it takes a year... traffic has to expand to fill the lane so it is as miserable as it was before. I try not to drive the 405 at all, but I was in a traffic jam; I have been consistently in traffic jams on a 9pm on a Sunday evening.

The best place to live, the most desirable place to live is the west side; Santa Monica, Venice... but if you have to get from the west side to... places where production goes on if you are in the entertainment industry, like Sony... I don't know, Warner Brothers... your commute... well my wife gets up at 4.45am to be on the road by 6.30am... because then she will have a chance of the stretch of the 405 being okay. But if the temperature keeps being nasty... if there are water wars, because there is a limited supply of water and it is going to get worse and worse across the southwestern states.

Everybody feeds off the Colorado River, which is insufficient. If commutes keep getting worse and worse... I don't think the entertainment industry people are going to want to make L.A their headquarters indefinitely. I was thinking 50 years from now; L.A will not be the entertainment capital. It will move north to maybe Silicone valley... maybe Seattle, maybe Vancouver. A lot of productions are up in Vancouver now but that's an economic thing as much as anything else. It is not because the temperatures are cooler but... 50 years might be optimistic. L.A might start turning more and more to shit... within 20 years.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 317 – Markets, Mothers, and Climate Change (3)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
October 11, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** Same yesterday. A couple of weeks ago it was up over 110 for a few days. Yeah statistically you might expect to get days like that every few years, but... if it is an every few year thing. The most famous freeway in L.A is probably the 405. I believe it is six lanes in each direction now.

You just... you can't add any more lanes. Adding more lanes, by the time you add the lane; because it takes a year... traffic has to expand to fill the lane so it is as miserable as it was before. I try not to drive the 405 at all, but I was in a traffic jam; I have been consistently in traffic jams on a 9pm on a Sunday evening.

The best place to live, the most desirable place to live is the west side; Santa Monica, Venice... but if you have to get from the west side to... places where production goes on if you are in the entertainment industry, like Sony... I don't know, Warner Brothers... your commute... well my wife gets up at 4.45am to be on the road by 6.30am... because then she will have a chance of the stretch of the 405 being okay. But if the temperature keeps being nasty... if there are water wars, because there is a limited supply of water and it is going to get worse and worse across the southwestern states.

Everybody feeds off the Colorado River, which is insufficient. If commutes keep getting worse and worse... I don't think the entertainment industry people are going to want to make L.A their headquarters indefinitely. I was thinking 50 years from now; L.A will not be the entertainment capital. It will move north to maybe Silicone valley... maybe Seattle, maybe Vancouver. A lot of productions are up in Vancouver now but that's an economic thing as much as anything else. It is not because the temperatures are cooler but... 50 years might be optimistic. L.A might start turning more and more to shit... within 20 years.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 318 – Markets, Mothers, and Climate Change (4)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
October 12, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: What is the main source of the inability to make sustainable changes in that state?**

**Rick Rosner:** Well one thing is that L.A is where people go to make their dreams of a life in entertainment and other fields... come true. Southern California has been a dream destination; a place to go to re-invent yourself... for 100 years and more. It is where the Oakies were. It is a nice place; the climate is nice when it is not 110. It's... L.A is full of famous people which is exciting and the chance that you might get famous yourself. It is socially liberal which... for most people are nice. Especially if you are someone who has moved to re-invent him or herself. L.A is a really great place to live, except for trying to get from one place to another. I have been here since '89 and... I have seen L.A go from where you can expect to get to anywhere within 30 minutes to where you can expect to get anywhere within an hour and a half if you are clever.

**Jacobsen: Another part of this conversation before taping; was the haze around where I live in British Columbia because of the fires up North of British Columbia... Canada... running down and making things quite warm and... actually having air quality warnings for... quote... not doing strenuous activity, unquote. We have... issues here too, but they are related to climate change. Climate change or global warming is a consistent issue which...America has a huge responsibility globally to make some very drastic, sustainable transitions... in the next few years or decade or two.**

**Rosner:** Well one thing is becoming increasingly clear; that is if you are still denying climate change, you are more and more of an idiot. There is some point in history where you might have been able to make reasonable arguments that climate change was not a big deal. But that point was maybe ten years ago, and the window for not being an idiot has closed. If you are still arguing that it doesn't exist and that there is no reason to get so worked up over it... then yeah, you are a stone schmuck.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 319 – Markets, Mothers, and Climate Change (5)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
October 13, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** So... bell curves of smartness and dumbness...

**Rick Rosner:** It's like smoking.

**Jacobsen:** Acceptance of climate change... are moving further and further apart in terms of the level of overlappingness?

**Rosner:** Yeah I mean... nobody is a complete... nobody would deny that smoking is bad for you now.

**Jacobsen:** Camel might disagree.

**Rosner:** Well nobody without and economic interest. But even those guys admit it. You have to be like pretty much a schmuck to still be smoking.

**Jacobsen:** Evil to be pushing it on people. Remember, the United States Agencies pushed it on demographics that were not smoking in particular. Pregnant women were a targeted demographic.

**Rosner:** I didn't know that.

**Jacobsen:** That is a huge crime. Same way...

**Rosner:** The people who committed that crime are all dead now. Half of them probably from smoking.

**Jacobsen:** Quite likely. As well as a targeted campaigns in a field called the psychology of nagging where... there was a demographic that was not buying things... that demographic being children; so if you can't get kids to buy things because they have no money, and you can't target ads to them... directly, what you can do is target ads to them to get to the parents indirectly, to nag the parents so that the kids will nag parents to buy things for those kids. That is a crime less severe but... insidious as well in terms of... hurting the morals of the country.

**Rosner:** Yeah well I remember being taught how to resist advertising in elementary school. They taught us the different forms of advertising. I think that is one more thing that has been squeezed out of the curriculum... along with art and music and P.E. There is just not enough money to teach anybody anything anymore.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 320 – Markets, Mothers, and Climate Change (6)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
October 14, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** Also there are pushes to do two things that build on the worst aspects of faith, religious faith. One, an attempt at reversion to literalist interpretation propped up. You can name many in your country. Another one is the use of non-literalist metaphor, allegorical interpretations of religious scripture... that just happen to align with the political and social... interests of far-Right wing ideological movements.

**Rick Rosner:** Yeah there is a log segment of the population on both sides; though I would tend to think it is more on the right... that have less and less... well... more and more excuse un-ethical behavior of their segment of society. They arm themselves with miss-information about what their opponents are doing, and this miss-information presents the opponents as so evil that... this type of aggressive Trump voting Christian thinks that whatever they do in being assholes is excused because their enemy is so horrible.

**Jacobsen:** Like the... you can build conditionals that have a whole host of premises in them. If you are pro-choice then you are a baby killer, as well as I do there a huge number of premises that are shoved into their heads through continual marketing campaigns.

**Rosner:** So there are two things going on that have created this. One is... right wing media, for the most part, clever right wing branding, which the Democrats never thought they needed to engage in because of democrats always a naively think that the facts will win out and common sense will win out. Jerry Mandering... super polarised both in people holding elective office and in the population. The more polarised we are, the more each side demonizes the other. The next major chance we get to reduce... Jerry Mandering based polarisation is in 2020, the US has a census every 10 years ending in zero. Congressional districts are supposed to be redrawn based on the results of each census. The Republicans kicked ass in 2010, they manipulated the district redrawing to fuck over the Democrats... the last seven years of politics have been especially retched largely because of the Republicans winning the redistricting battle of 2010. Which the Democrats didn't even really know they were fighting. But, the Democrats will know, they do know that they need to do better in 2020. We may get... every few months a redistricting case... or a lawsuit makes it to a higher court and... we may get better district in 2020. Or a 5:4 Supreme Court may say fuck you to redistricting... but we got a shot in 2020.

**Jacobsen:** That's all good.

**Rosner:** Except me may accept buying a duplex up near you in Canada.

**Jacobsen:** I look forward to seeing ya.

**Rosner:** Okay, you can scout out properties.

**Jacobsen:** They are not that expensive depending on what you get. If I was... let's say... I'm an engaged dude, baby, on the way... so I am thinking two and a half on the way. 1500 bucks for a decent place. For a one-room place for a single person, like a bachelor suite can be from 650 to 1050.

**Rosner:** You can't do anything in L.A for that. Might be able to live in somebody's garage. I have known people to do that. Anyway, what you are looking for is a duplex where they had a drug deal that died and wasn't found for about a month so the smell is not good. That is usually the best bargain. Based on an urban legend on a Corvette that's for sale for \$300.

[End of recorded material]



## Ask A Genius 321 – Mating Strategies (1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

October 15, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** I think that what you see in terms of partnership choices in the future may reflect mating strategies. When you have... today and for the past few decades, when you have unusual mating arrangements, like people in a three-way mating arrangement or a four-way. It's, it's sensational, it's something you'd say on—goodbye.

It's something you'd see in an HBO like sex documentary. It's seen as fascinating or titillating. But in the future, I think differing you know, mating arrangements other than two people closely bonded for a period of time will become more common. Partially because it's... there's more support for you know, alternate lifestyles, due to increased information via the internet and social media. Increased tolerance. And to say increased tolerance...

And these, the gender fluidity was something that was you know, largely unheard of a decade or two ago. That person could change their minds about who they are sexual. I think, well, just people didn't know that that was a thing and to the extent that they did know it was a thing was like, like an oh come on thing, really, how much more are we going to have to deal with in terms of new, like, genders or gender orientations.

And as time goes on, people will grow to be more at home than just with tolerant attitudes. Expansive attitudes. But in terms of mate selection, alternate or non-traditional partners—nontraditional joining of people may in itself be a sexual... a strategy to, maybe a sexual strategy that you know, in relationships where a woman is in love with more than one guy or is in love with a woman and a guy.

A guy is in love with two women. Those things may turn out to be, for some people, ways to have relationships where perhaps one or more of the people in the relationship felt closed out of partnerships in the past. Either due to personal preferences or due to just not being able to find a niche to be successful in, not being able to find a way to be sexually successful.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 322 – Mating Strategies (2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

October 16, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** What niches in the future will be exaggerated, as some niches are more exaggerated now?

**Rick Rosner:** You mean what niches will be—what niches—what roles will offer certain people chances of sexual success the way the job role offered people success for 100 years?

**Jacobsen:** Yes, also the characteristics or factors that comprise them. For instance, the modern LA version of the big booty with the Kardashians, for example.

**Rosner:** Well, I mean, I can tell you with regard to fashion, which is not to say body styles, but if you look at the history of fashion, some new part of the body is always being revealed or emphasized. In the '80s, leg holes kept getting higher and higher.

Instead of going straight across, at the lower thigh, they kept creeping upward until eventually, you had thongs, so more and more of the upper thigh and butt was revealed. In various times in history, we've had side boob eras.

So yeah, we right now are in an era that emphasizes the butt. So we can assume that trends in what we reveal about what we focus on in the body will continue to—there will be, the parts of the body that we focus on will continue to change. There won't always be the emphasis on a single body part that we have now.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 323 – Mating Strategies (3)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

October 17, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** But there will always be a novelty. It won't signify much. You know, fashion exists to perpetuate itself via novelty. Sometimes it reflects a something maybe important about the culture, the way that fashion has shifted to allow for heavier people, the way that body consciousness in fashion has shifted in America and the rest of the world over the past 20 years to accommodate people who are on average much heavier than they were in the '70s.

But you know, fashion is fashion. It shifts around to give people an excuse to buy new stuff. And I've read arguments that say that trends in fashion have been replaced by an omnivorousness in fashion where anything that worked in the past can now be, you know, seen as fashion now, that somebody could dress as they dressed 20, 25 years ago, walk down the street without drawing any attention because we now live in an era of anythingness.

It may be due to increased, just you know, just increased information, that if you can see all of the fashion, all of the history of fashion laid out in front of you just by clicking around on the internet, then there's less, you know, era-wise or now wise enforcement of fashion rules, because people have more information.

Similarly, in terms of competing for mates, there may be more of an anything goes because people have more information. And more access to all sorts of different people via social media. So you asked... who's going to be successful in the future at sexual—at attracting mates?

One new, I don't know if it's new, but it certainly, more important now than in the past, is people who accept all body types. People don't apply rigorously, the rigorous physical standards of sexual attractiveness of the past will do well now and into the future in which you know, we're growing more accepting of people as they are now. That is the... when I was growing up, might get in the weeds here but... you know, not that—throughout most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, there were severe constraints on who was allowed to have sex.

Married people were allowed to have sex. People who took themselves out of the realm of social approval, of course, could have sex, which meant like prostitutes. There was a huge prostitution culture in the US in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. But beyond that, people weren't supposed to have sex.

You had to, I mean there were times when people had sex, like World War II, standards were—nobody, it wasn't overt, standards weren't overtly low, sexual prohibitions weren't overtly lowered but people, you know, about to go off to maybe die, yeah, there was a lot of people hooking up before they went off to battle and such.

There was still urgency. But there were still huge prohibitions on sex outside of wedlock. Now that you know, most of that is eroded. And eroding along with that are standards about who's

attractive. Rigid standards of sexual fitness. And people who are able to see the beauty in everyone are going to—and who want to have sex with people are going to be offered greater opportunities.

That's about it.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 324 – The Feynman Thing (1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

October 18, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** That Feynman thing that he said in a speech about the future of science which there are three possible futures.

Science figures out everything within or almost everything within a reasonably short time frame say a few centuries or number two science continues to make steady progress, never gets to the point where it gives us an understanding of everything, we learn more and more but it turns out that you can't understand everything or three science it's the law and we reached we reached the limit of what can be understood via science which equals what can be understood period and your question postulate a number three situation that turns out that you have a limited ability to understand and gain power over creation.

And so that we rise to a certain level of technology and then we stay there and for as much of the future as we can imagine and that could be a thing, much science fiction takes place in that world because it's easier to imagine like things space opera which is a casual term for Star Wars is the best-known space.

Opera, it's human civilization as we know it now extended to cover a big chunk of the galaxy, but it's humans being humans but on a larger spatial and temporal scale, but what humans want the forms humans to have the forms other species have are all basically human and humans do what they've always done which is fight wars, build civilizations they just do it on a bunch of planets instead of just one and that's what you get, maybe you don't even get that because Star Wars depends on faster than light travel you can't have an empire if you can't travel faster than light because the time required just makes it completely undoable but I don't think that's what will happen I think we have enough of an understanding of the potential of future technology to know that at the very least, the lives that we're living now will be completely transformed.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 325 – The Feynman Thing (2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

October 19, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** Now it's possible we could reach a limit to three hundred years from now where the earth is wrapped up in a big ball of information processing entities that are coming together and bubbling apart like a lava lamp and that might be the pinnacle of what a civilization can achieve but I doubt that too, I think in some ways civilization keeps going and becoming more powerful.

On the other hand that's hard to conceive because in a universe that is at least fourteen billion years old and possibly according to our theory like a gazillion times older than that, yes you'll have, you should have the civilization that is tens of millions of years old and more and I don't know how you have civilizations that just keep getting more sophisticated on a ten million years scale, so it may be that yeah that civilizations reach a point where they require some stability and don't continue to rejigger themselves, that's highly possible but I find it highly not possible that the stopping point is at anything like the world we have now. We haven't reached any of the limits of, we're still making big strides in understanding the brain which I think means that we're eventually going to understand consciousness and computation and an information-based universe and we're not at the limits of the worst laws in any of its form.

We will hit the limits of Moore's Law in some of its forms within the next ten or fifteen years that we will probably be stymied when it comes to, you can't go smaller than atoms for instance as information storage device or you may be can if you go quantum but still you're going to run into some fairly daunting physical limits in terms of miniaturization for that aspect of Moore's Law, but even so we're still, there will be ways to dance around the limitations of the various Moore's laws and.

We're nowhere near having the computational power that we'll have when we do start hitting those fairly hard limits. So we're going to be rejiggered. How long the rejiggering goes on it is an open question but let's say that we have a future of celebrating the change that will go for thousands of years at least.

So you can, some people speculate about a future of inside a Dyson's sphere which is a completely built out solar system where all the planets have been dismantled and turned into the shell that rides or surrounds a star to absorb all the rate of solar heat the solar radiation are using computation and then releases it as wasting and that maybe some, probably won't be what happens because we're trying to imagine the future from a very ignorant point in time but I can imagine that there will be a fairly built out completely built out future sometimes thousands of years in the future that may be stable for a long time. But I don't think we reach that point for many, many, for at least several tens of centuries. That's it.

[End of recorded material]

## **Ask A Genius 326 – Divinity and Human Exaltation**

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner**

**October 20, 2017**

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: What were we talking about? Ah yes, the future and comprehending the short, mid, and long-term.**

**Rick Rosner:** Yes, it was about the near, what is in the middle, and what is here to come.

**Jacobsen: We were talking about the short, mid and long-term future, and what is here to come. We were speaking about our time expectations. Along the way, I've noted something which some may find humiliating; it's about the 'Erosion of the Assumption of Divinity.'**

**Rick Rosner:** I'd like to call it, the 'End of Human Exaltation and the Human Experience,' but I am afraid to say that humans will have little to no joy in the upcoming years. You can say it in other words as it is the story about humans and humanity regarding their existence in different forms. Let's begin with outlining the near future as it is what every human expects at this time.

This is regarding the next 50-100 years, or basically the whole 21<sup>st</sup> Century and we are talking about the technologies and devices that will have a major impact on the humanity, their way of living and existing. These devices and technologies are here to aid us with our perception and our behaviour towards the world. When we are addressing to the mid-future, this is one of the most interesting ones and the strangest of them all. This period offers us technologies and abilities that we haven't experienced before.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 327 - Comedy Change

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

October 21, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** How has comedy changed for now compared to the past? How will this change the future of comedy as well?

**Rick Rosner:** Well, I mean the biggest change applies to all information and media and entertainment and it's just the sheer volume and variety available. I read someplace that people in the 17th century, 18th century maybe only had two books in their houses; the Bible and Pilgrim's Progress.

Similarly somebody on a farm; how many jokes would that person hear a hundred years ago in the course of a week? Two? Maybe goes to town, hears a couple jokes? Three? I don't know. Now the average joke consumer, say somebody who watches late-night TV is going to see at least twenty-five jokes a night, somebody goes on Twitter looking for jokes can read hundreds a day, will see The Good Place comes back tonight; it's the sitcom set in heaven, you watch a sitcom and a decent sitcom will give you 40 jokes in 22 minutes, just people today have heard a gazillion jokes, people also have more information about which we can joke than Johnny Carson could joke about in the 1970s.

Carson's writers wrote off the teletype, they had an AP news feed that was this automatic typewriter the go [mimics typewriter sound], it would spit out a big roll of paper with the stories of the day and those guys would see those stories and they would... largely, guys, I don't know how many women worked on the Tonight Show writing staff, but it was less than half a dozen or fewer than that. But anyway, they were writing off 20 stories they got from the news maybe somebody brought in newspapers but the number of different things that could be joked about or smaller because people have less information.

So, what the future holds is more volume, I mean Twitter has empowered thousands of people who wouldn't otherwise be writing jokes to be writing jokes and the other social media encourages other forms of humor. So, you'll have more people doing, you'll have faster delivery and you'll have a greater informational basis for the jokes.

Also, there's been an erosion of taboos where I don't know how much farther it can go but you can joke about anything, where in the past you had to watch what you joked about because some things were improper. Now you can joke about anything, any subject you can manage to think of to joke about. Now with taboos gone and everything permitted everything's been kind of colonized or exploited for jokes and it's tough to come up with new areas. That's about it.

[End of recorded material]



## Ask A Genius 328 - The Future

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

October 22, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** What were we talking about? Ah yes, the future and comprehending about short, mid, and long-term.

**Rick Rosner:** Yes, it was about the near, what is in the middle, and what is here to come.

**Jacobsen:** We were talking about the short, mid and long-term future, and what is here to come. We were speaking about our time expectations. Along the way, I've noted something which you may find humiliating, and it's about the Erosion of the Theory of Spirituality.

**Rosner:** I'd like to call it the Fantastic Future, but I am afraid to say that humans will have little to no joy in the upcoming years. You can say it in other words as it is the story about humans and humanity regarding their existence in different forms. Let's begin with outlining the near future as it is what every human expects at this time.

This is regarding the next 50-100 years, or basically the whole 21<sup>st</sup> Century and we are talking about the technologies and devices that will have a major impact on the humanity, their way of living and existing.

These devices and technologies are here to aid us with our perception and our behaviour towards the world. When we are addressing to the mid-future, this is one of the most interesting ones and the strangest of them all.

This period offers us technologies and abilities that we haven't experienced before. This will most definitely change the relationship between humans and machines, and humans and humans overall in a funny way.

This will gradually increase the search for new ways of completing regular tasks, while constantly moving back and forward in time using the traditional, already proven correct ways, simply because they are already proven to be working and they are well-defined and friendly in our lives.

After this, the long-term future follows, where we use outdated, well proven systems that we are certain they work. They are bonding together with the other forms of existence that we've developed throughout the near and mid future, but are slowly fading due to the changes that we've made over the decades, as they are easy to adopt and pretty useful. Because the new ways are connected with technology, being a human being as we are now or in the near-future will be considered as outdated.

One thing is for sure, the human communities will always be there, no matter how far in the future we manage to survive.

I want to make a point that we will have a pool of options, but will only follow one path, a path that this human now doesn't want to live like. Another way into looking these three, the near, the mid and the far future is up to the personal way of seeing them.

The far future is a little bit out of the reach of our eyes and imagination, therefore we can't clearly see how it will be, as we don't know the path that the near and mid future is going to take. One thing is for certain – the future will be more informative than always, with a big data of information available, where we will rely on it for our evaluation.

The computers will play a major part in the world, and most probably out in Space, and people will have more and more knowledge in computing as the days go by. Here, we will have to use the Moore's law, where the cost of the computing will get cut in half in the next 18 or 24 months.

This is yet to be seen as we have no idea what kind of computing will be available in the next decade or so. This is closely connected to the size of the computing and the Moore's law of things getting double smaller. However, certain magazines state that computing cannot get smaller, and with the atomic limitation that we have, we already have several more generations to come and work on reaching that level of computing.

But will it stop there? One thing is certain, that quantum computing beats and will soon overshadow non-quantum computing in every way. And while the limitation that Moore's law has set on the way the computing will go in the future we are talking about, there is a chance of a curve that can change it all, and it all comes down that we are still unable to predict how far actually the future can be to tell this information for certain.

The data processing and information bombarding alongside computing will be a huge part of our future, and it will be a lot different than the computing we are experiencing at the moment.

But the tables and sheets that we are seeing now will stay here, in the past – it will be able to produce real time models of the numbers included in the data in just few seconds. This means, the data can be used for quick access of information, and will be beneficial for making money, making crucial decisions on tie, and will most definitely help them with their lifestyle and movement in life.

This will most certainly affect the life of the people living at that time as there will be rapid changes in the entity, which will be part of the world in the future. When we look back in the past, Greg Bayer has a novel called Blood Music from the 90s that I enjoy reading, and it talks about nano-bots that will infect an engineer and the reaction of the body as an effect after this infection. It is the same feeling as Superman, where he is holding the city in a bottle in his hand, and in one point, after he gets used to the effect, he becomes the guardian of the city in the bottle.

However, this novel revolves differently than my opinion, and there the guardian evolves faster than it should, while we are yet to begin the changes that will happen. This is all I have in mind for the time being. If I add something more it will only interfere with what I've already said.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 329 - The Worst President

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

October 23, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** At the moment, we are talking while not recording about Trump and his skills. What is Trump good at?

**Rick Rosner:** The major thing that he is best at, is being bad at doing what he does. He is good at showing the people that it was not what America actually needed. A modest person with solid knowledge of history, empathy for the people and lacking self-control won't do it.

If you have any doubts, take some great president, or even take a good one, and compare the results. Let's take Lincoln, as he is considered a great president. In a war where over 60,000 Americans lost their lives, he was the leader of the country.

And despite this, he is known for his deep feelings and humanity, he always tried to hold the American Union together even when it was crumbling after the war, and his humor after all. When you take a glance at FDR who managed to successfully take America out of depression, which was one of the most miserable times for the States, fast forward from the World War II, and all while his legs were mechanical with braces - he could make the change!

Take Teddy Roosevelt who has a great intellectual curiosity, read a vast number of books, and wrote fifty books all in the name of the natural world. Trump slowly fades from every great, or even good president, and the image of him feels low after reading this. He does not have any skill, and he is a pure experiment on the chair.

It is positive to see that Trump is always doing something without even possessing some of the skills that the other presidents had, and it's good to see that he can function like that. But it seems like everything that Trump does is doing destructive things to the country.

He is the best gest case that the country could have as the people can see how he does and can get rid of him even before the four years are completed.

This may end up with a more dangerous scenario because if Trump finishes the mandate before the four years are passed, it will come down to putting Pence, an even more risky potential candidate for the role which has some crazy ideas in the Oval Office.

A better place to put Trump while still having him do something high in the country should be somewhere where balance is not the strong side, and that can be used in his advantage.

Even this place isn't one hundred percent certain that it will be a good fit, but it isn't certain that it isn't, which means that maybe there is a chance for Trump to prosper with his skills after all.

This was all accomplished via the same and similar behavior that has been going on with our country for a long time now, slowing down their interests, keeping them under control and bad acting over the countries.

The same happened with the Second World War where we backed down from the conflicts that were happening in the world, especially Europe; we backed down from the field and decided to enter it after the war had already started.

Two and a half years after the war had begun, we got in to negotiate after Hitler already had taken a big part of Europe and had made his decisions on what he wants to do with it. After entering and negotiating on the Europe field, we were more than effective, and we proved that we are the world's most powerful nation.

Another thing that is worth mentioning at this time is the shutting down of the North Korean nuclear program after they kept itching and bragging that their nuclear power was outstanding and their nuclear weapons are extraordinary and powerful.

The interesting thing here is that there are two crazy people on top of the top 3 nations in the world. One has the most powerful army while the other one has nuclear weapons which we might believe are shut down, but are they really?

I'd prefer Obama, Hilary or even George W. Bush to use their diplomatic skills against Kim Jong Hong and calm this tension a little bit down. But Donald Trump, as crazy as he could be, has been trying something else, and has an Ace up his sleeve.

He has been flattering the China leader for some time now, and his plan is obvious – to have two helping hands against the North Korea that will strike from a different side. This is rather funny as having the best army in the world you shouldn't be acting as a baby requesting for a babysitter, but there are some hidden intentions behind this I reckon.

This thing is good as the main quest is to scare the bad courtiers and to let them know that they should back off, but it is not a 100% completed quest. I should mention another good thing about Trump and what he does as a president, and I already touched this theme earlier; he makes the Republicans less efficient in their intentions, and their harmful ideas against the country are no longer as effective as they were in the past.

On the other hand, this, and even more, should be done by someone more organized and better in the cerebral thinking, but let's put half a point on Trump's expense and as I mentioned before, it is the test case of what we really need sitting in the president's seat, which will form a clear picture with the help of Trump doing all what he does.

And several small mistakes have been made in terms of his ego rising and him abandoning the golf club, thinking he should rage as much as he want and double his dos, all because he is a president of America. And on top of that add promotion of the books that his daughters wrote and promoting Arolago while using the government's resources speaks for itself.

This is the whole picture, but there is another think that will make Trump good that just came to my mind. When compared to the other competitor for the worst president in the United States of America, Warren Harding, was listening to what the people had to say, while on the other hand, the current president Trump.

On seventy years and with extra weight, having obesity or whatever you want to call it, is always being the target of angry critiques, that he is losing weight by giving speeches only, and he encourages on pursuing the perfect song to implement in his speeches, and when you combine all of this and the negative talks on him together with the weight problem, there is a possibility that he will get light-hit in his head and leave chair without finishing to serve his term as he will be unhealthy from physical and mental point of view. This is one of the things Trump is good at, and hopefully he will get discouraged because he is acting like a baby, which will lead to leaving the Oval room.

This is basically everything I have, and I hope I have it all on a list as it will be a useful list. Well one more thing is that the Democrats are as disorganized as they could ever be, and with this opportunity to rise, Trump may be the one to enlighten them and give them a paved way of where they should walk in order to come up with the good inaudible news that America is waiting on.

The mid-terms that they did in 2010 or 2014 should be used as an example so Trump may have the opportunity to walk away as a winner in some field after all, and it is to stimulate the efficiency of the Republicans part after all.

And when you think through it, it's not easy at all to give a positive thinking when all of this is under the command of the government and it is a task that should be handled by the president, so we are giving Trump a credit for what he is supposed to do. Here are the several reasons why Trump is good at what he is doing, and why he should stick around.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 330 - No One Expects the Spanish Inquisition

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
October 24, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** The primal thought was the search of the generations of people and how it was interrupted. And to see the level of interruption is a real tough job for someone. There are many prejudices and almost constantly, year by year, a group of people like German Jews, and European Jews faced in the 1920s.

After more than six million being slaughtered, and 5 times more were forced away from their homeland, the story doesn't end here. The genocide in Lebanon in Africa is another story for this story, with killing and expelling people from their countries in the 70s.

And Syria, maybe not the best country in the world but was functioning well, and now with the civil war going, we can see how Hell on Earth looks like, and Iraq, after few small wars against Iran, now it has 10 thousand of killed people under their name because of the dictation.

So, if you zoom out and take a look at these countries alongside the Spanish Inquisition, you will see that all of these countries that are in Africa and the Middle East were well-functioning countries, and pretty stable for a long period of time, and all of a sudden, something appears where the whole nation is wiped, pushed away from the land and what else not. And here in America, we are playing under a different politic that reflects on the world.

We are not expecting the future to be against us, but as it seems it will be. What will happen with the disruption of the happenings in the world in the next three to five decades will be nothing compared to what we have seen in the past years.

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** Most people won't be prepared for the change.

**Rosner:** What most people can do when facing the future humans, is that they can die, like every person in the world. IF you don't get ended by the disruption, you will simply get older and older and die out of old age. That's how things work.

Old generations get wiped out, New ones come and are getting better at accepting the future and making the most out of it, and that's just the way this world works. That's all.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 331 - Science and Religion (1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

October 25, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** One of the main conflicts over time has been religion and theology, which comes from religion, and changes in the scientific framework of looking at the world, which is a refinement of the way you're looking at the natural world. Often, that conflict has led to a diminishment in the religious authority on the say of what the real world is or looks like.

**Rick Rosner:** Okay, the authority depends on what set of beliefs you give yourself, over to the huge percentage of Americans who prefer to believe in some fully Christian point of view. Science doesn't hold this way, except for a sense of uneasiness, but you're just wrong given its science that's generated so much in the world.

You're denying the parts you don't find convenient but, I mean historically. It goes like this: I think in the beginning there was no religion or science, but religion got there first in terms of laws in that people believed it's easier to construct the system of beliefs that don't have to account for the entire world, don't have to be a full-on match between - well, I put myself in kind of a sac here - but with religion you can make a set of stories about the world that whatever aspects of the world you need.

It doesn't have any kind of rigorous logic and the religious institution, churches come with leverage over people's lives and beliefs, and have all sorts of authority in various ways and then when people start doing the experimental, the Greeks and the Romans were not, they didn't embrace it.

They didn't thoroughly embrace the program of experimental science. They did science. But it was part of an overall philosophical push that science will be used to fully understand and explain the world, so there were little outbreaks of science but they didn't as far as I know thoroughly conflict with religion, but then, later on, you start as a religion that's been in place with the policies for over a millennium when you have persons like Copernicus and Galileo starting, and so there are doctrines that are now fairly locked up.

Copernicus and Galileo came up with stuff that kind of rub the doctrine the wrong way, the people who advocate with power who advocate for these doctrines the wrong way. Their religions have had twelve hundred years to become fleshed out and with twelve hundred years to be fleshed out so you can imagine a younger version of Christianity not having a problem with the earth going around the sun.

I mean there is nothing inherently un-Christian about that it doesn't have to conflict with Creation. God made the world and the Sun that we orbit around for us. He created Humanity. I don't think there is the level of conflict that we've seen in the past few hundred years between religion and science because science didn't fully encroach upon the world, and science wasn't

seen or embraced as a program fully explaining everything until I don't know, sixteen hundred, seventeen hundred, eighteen hundred, I don't know.

Yet people who would argue that Newton was more religious than scientific and he believed that he was doing God's work by doing science, that God wanted us to understand the world and that was part of working on his behalf almost like God helps people who help themselves.

I knew he was one of the first guys. People that come up with the scientific theories have little scientific theories. But his really in a way wasn't, it was fairly concrete and made concrete predictions about the entire universe.

[End of recorded material]



## Ask A Genius 332 - Science and Religion (2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

October 26, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** The concepts of infinity, dynamics, relativity, and the quantum theory played and play big roles in science, so should in the interpretation of the theology too.

**Rick Rosner:** The previous theories just extended from us out to infinity pretty much with a universal rotation. It was right there. The big and universal theories are going to start crashing into religious doctrines, which tends to be universal and many of the tendencies of science keep pushing humanity away from the centre of creation with the biggest push or shove against humanity that we are at the specially created centre is the evolution, which comes up in the eighteen fifties.

It did come up before that, but it didn't come up persuadable until Darwin and the other guy whose name I always forget as the guy who kind of co-published with Darwin, but Darwin's version of evolution caught on and in one hundred and sixty years. You have a Big Bang Theory, for now, which postulates a world without any special agencies.

I mean originally in science nobody has the idea till the seventeen hundreds of the Unified Field or anything like that. That is one set of fairly compact equations or physical explanations that account for everything. You don't start to get Unified Field Theories until maybe the second half of the nineteenth century, where there are four equations

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 333 - Science and Religion (3)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

October 27, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** We've been under that program, strongly. It was probably the most scientific laws in one era. If you ask most scientists if they believe in the idea of a unified explanation for the entire universe, you'd probably get two thirds or more believing in it.

A unified physical explanation under the current theoretical support. Our current theoretical and experimental support for that point of view, but there is no room for a creator or an active being. I mean there are various versions of creation that try to make some kind of compromise with modern Big Bang unification physics including, God doesn't act in the world today.

The world acts on its own, but God considers everything in motion, but beyond an unsatisfying compromise like that, then God has been squeezed out. However, you and I have been talking about IC for years now. I see it superimposes as a unifying set of principles and that they count for what goes on, so those principles don't necessarily hard-edged, or those principles are fuzzy at edges.

They become more hard-edged. They reveal the principles of existence. That they really are the principles that we're talking about.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 334 - Science and Religion (4)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

October 28, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** Others I see pertaining to things that not only non-contradictory things can exist and non-contradiction becomes stronger with the more information you have in the system, and that the system was loaded with information is fuzzy.

You have all sorts of things that in ways are dictated more or less by quantum mechanics, where they can exist or not exist.

They are kind of on the cusp of being in existence till you see that they do or don't contradict the rest of the information in the system and the more information you have in the system the more you have to be contradicted and the more things kind of have to come in line with the rest of the information that exists, so it's a fuzzy kind of system of rules and existences that gets tired and tired the more information you have which means more space, more time for matter because all those things reflect the amount of information in the system and then so I mean that still doesn't allow for a creator or a religious point of view.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 335 – Science and Religion (5)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

October 29, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Rick Rosner:** However, if you look at consciousness, this is kind of the second principle that I see that consciousness probably is technical but as principles or attributes, consciousness is an attribute of large-scale information sharing within the system.

For our system to exist, it has to have a large degree of self-consistency and self-consistency requires a large sharing of information because you can't be consistent with what you don't have information about.

You have to constantly keep the rest of each part of itself against the condition as a part of self-consistency that is finding it, the universe has constantly defined itself very precisely in order to impose self-consistency on itself and a consciousness is a necessary adjunct in this large-scale sharing of information.

Then it is unavoidable if in large-scale self-consistent systems. In the end, that implies the hands of the creator because we can't create worlds. We can, at some point, have the technical wherewithal to create simulated worlds with simulated thinking beings if we want to.

We can also create a self-consistent world where all the self-consistency is supposedly outside and there is no large-scale information sharing. That's kind of what happens with computers. We build the computers. They process information linearly.

They don't police themselves for the most part. Computers aren't conscious, but the existence of large created systems like computers implies that they are part of a larger world in which there are beings that are conscious.

Sub-consciousness may be an unavoidable aspect of existence and that still does not imply a creator in many instances. Most instances do imply the existence of consciousnesses of unlimited extent and power.

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: A functionally unlimited number of them. It's for all intents and purposes. It's for all intents and purposes unlimited.**

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 336 – AIs Wants and Types

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

November 1, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: What is going on with AI and if/when it's eventually developed more and more what will it want, if we can use that phrasing?**

**Rick Rosner:** You and I coincidentally both read the same essay, which attacked the science-fiction views of robots running amok trying to kill humanity and taking over the work. This essay rightfully did that, but then it didn't get into specifics.

It went off in a different direction or the guy started talking about a novel that he's written, which has some AI in it. So, we could talk about what AI might want and let's dispense with the mid-future like more than 50-100 years from now, more than 80 years from now.

There will be a point at which AI could be given human-like abilities and one of the reasons that it would be given those abilities is because humans like companions and human-like interfaces and companions already do that to an extent.

We can talk with Siri and Alexa and all that junk, and within right around the end of the century we should be able to build pretty decent robot girlfriends, robot butler's, robot advisors, that at least understand what humans want and to some extent can be made to at least simulate those wants in themselves.

It could be for the purposes of being a sassy girlfriend, but the deal by that time, I predict, is that we will have a good mathematical model of consciousness, which will allow us to reasonably accurately predict the different ways in which AIs that have been built to be human-like might behave and misbehave.

Given that model, there will be regulations about the prudent construction of AI. So, you don't have an AI that's been built to run amok; of course, there are all the assholes who do that anyway. Those AIs that have been programmed to act in human ways and in malicious ways, whether human or not.

That will be an issue to deal with. But what you won't get, I don't think, is mission creep, which is the way that almost all malevolent AIs in science fiction turn bad; it's robots or AIs being made to be our servants, but then they start thinking about their duties and in more wide-ranging or more general ways.

They start following chains of reason to the point where they decide that the real problem with preserving the Earth is humans. Then they decide to kill all humans, which is pretty much Skynet and dozens of other science fiction things.

But the AIs that we'll be building for most of this century won't have that much mission creep. Then the AIs with the intellectual potential, the mental potential to do that level of reasoning, by the time we're able to build those, we'll have enough of a mathematical understanding of the mental landscape of what we're building that we can pretty much engineer AIs that don't have dangerous levels of mission creep.

So, you've got two areas of non-threat; you've got AIs that are built after the end of the century that is highly sophisticated and powerful but have been prudently engineered. So, no threat there or little threat there.

Then you have AIs built during this century that aren't powerful enough to be a threat, then you have a two non-threats. Then the threat is AIs built by assholes in order to cause mischief or worse. That's a medium to the low level threat on a level of terrorism today, which is bad, but it's not freaking World War II bad.

So, then you have one major threat that we haven't talked about which is piggybacked AI, which will be for the next 100 years or more; the most powerful form of AI, which is to whatever tech we have in terms of information processing in conjunction with people who are good at using that tech and eventually merging with that tech.

So, it's not robots on there, but it'll be people; rich people, smart people using whatever AI exists to obtain further advantages over other people by being able to think faster, being able to find patterns faster and deeper, and engaging in a normal human competition with increasing advantages via AI.

And so, of the four forms of AI that can cause problems, that one is probably the one I'd worry about the most.

**Jacobsen: When you talk about prudently engineered AI in the next 80 years or so, the mathematical model of consciousness as an information processing complex will likely include a moral system akin to a tighter, more precise, and well-defined Golden Rule, which trims potentially harmful choices to people and other living things on the part of AI systems however sophisticated.**

**Rosner:** I mean you've got the other who will be able to mathematically implement some things along the lines of Asimov's *Three Laws of Robotics* when it becomes necessary. We won't have that mathematical model say for another ten, twenty, or thirty years possibly.

We won't need the model to control AI or predict possible glitches in AI for decades after that. But yes, I don't know if you'll build the Golden Rule. My buddy says there will be a trillion AI in the world by 2100.

Most of that AI won't be sophisticated enough or conscious enough to be set out into the world meeting the Golden Rule standards, where it's deeply embedded in there. Most AIs won't be philosophers, but there will be some people who will want AI companions.

Some artists will strive to make AI as human as possible, but most AIs will be engineered for some specific sets of tasks and won't be that deep. Although, you can picture a point, say 140 years from now or 150 years from now, where it's cheap to build conscious AIs.

So, there may be some sloppy work and some abuse where you build AIs that have a full complement of feelings, even where it's not necessary because its slapping a sophisticated AI consciousness into a system that might cost the equivalent of five of today's dollars.

So, yes, that crap is going to be going on. You'd want a bunch of sophisticated controls either engineered into the AI itself or else roving AI sniffers that'll look for AIs that are overpowered that could go bad; overpowered and under control.

I mean this is all part of a landscape that in some ways will be a hyper version of today's landscape with hacker wars and cybercrime, sponsored by all sorts of entities from private A-holes to governments. One form of AI that's already messing stuff up is almost too banal or banal.

However, the disruption caused by automation taking jobs. It's not as bad as it's going to be. We're already suffering from it, but that's not the threat by AI that people talk about when they talk about the risk of robots taking over which leads to what you noticed which is... go ahead.

**Jacobsen: I watched a panel of middle-aged white, smart people who specialize in some form of AI or who've done some thinking on AI, or panicking about it more properly. The demographics being middle-aged white dudes. There is a hype.**

**So, I feel as though it's mostly North American phenomena, barring Demis Hassabis and a couple others. It's white or Caucasian men in the 35 to 55 range and if that's a thing for any particular reason, but it does seem like it's a thing, for whatever reason.**

**Rosner:** For one thing, those are the guys who are most qualified to think about it. They're the early adaptors; they're the guys who they've been successful in the world of tech. People like them to talk about tech issues.

The "I've decided it's prudent at this point to start talking about the possible risks of AI." And I agree with them. I'm a middle-aged white guy though not as successful as those guys. I agree that it's prudent.

I predicted that we will have good controls with an understanding in place by the time we need it, but that's a guess. We won't get those controls. That understanding, unless, we start working on it now.

So, I agree it did make sense to start thinking about what the issues are. However, remote they are; they're fairly remote, but those guys, I mean, the cost of making of a mistake that turns over the world to malevolent AI is obviously the entire world.

So, even if it's a remote possibility, you got to a look at it as a similar threat that that looks, if not remote, it looks like it's it won't become a threat for many years in the future. It won't become a threat for many years.

Nanotechnology, where people have been worried for decades about the grey goo, where you make a little teeny molecular machine, a tiny little automaton, that eats whatever's in its path to make more copies of itself.

Then all these copies eventually infect the world turning the entire world into these little machines that in swarms resemble the grey goo. We don't know whether that's a reasonable possibility, but, I mean, there are no steps in the imaginary process that don't seem completely impossible.

I mean there are no steps in the process that seem completely impossible. So, that's something that we will have to investigate and guard against; though at this point in history, it's remote because we don't have the tech yet.

It might turn out upon analysis to be an unlikely occurrence, but the cost of that occurrence which is again the death of everything on the planet makes it merit serious investigation.

[End of recorded material]



# Ask A Genius 337 - When the Presidenting Gets Tough, the Tough Twitter

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
November 8, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: What is the relationship between Watergate and Trump?**

**Rick Rosner:** In a nutshell, it looks probable that this will get worse than Watergate because Trump's support is holding up. During Watergate, it was possible to get Nixon out. The Republican leadership went to Nixon and said that the country's lost confidence in you.

Nixon agreed with that assessment and left office, but Trump is not somebody to do that and he continues to have the support of three-eighths of the country. So, it's a crisis that may not break for quite a while.

It's got a certain stability, which may allow it to get worse and worse before there's any resolution. Plus, like Trump says stupid shit; he tweets stupid shit every day. Nixon had some of the political savvy to not make his position worse every single day of the week.

So, it's made me wonder. It is one of those situations where people will soon start asking themselves, "Is it time for us to start taking personal action to protect ourselves?" But that seems like an overreaction because most of all this stuff is taking place on Twitter and among a few people in Washington.

It's not like Germany in the '30s when people were getting attacked on the street, but it still, if you're not an idiot, feels different from any other point of politics during our lives. We've had some weird points. We had the weird political limbo of Bush versus Gore after the election in 2000.

We've already had the weirdness of Trump and losing the popular vote by 2.8 million votes still not admitting it. I mean, there are extra dimensions to the weirdness because Trump has been doing weird shit since he got elected and even before.

It's possible to think that this isn't a weird moment because it's more Trump, but it's a point of political peril. It doesn't seem like it will break for months and months. And he got rid of Sean Spicer, the Press Secretary.

The new guy who's not the Press Secretary will be running the communications offices is slick and well-spoken and that guy might be better at running a communications office than whoever was in charge before and because of his slickness might even increase Trump's popularity, even in the middle of Trump being consistently terrible at his job and at optics.

So, anyway, we're in trouble. It looks like the trouble is going to go on for months and months to come. That's it.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 338 - Pain, Pain, Go Away, Come Back Another Day

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
November 15, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Jacobsen: What would a model of human thought and behavior look like with this information-based view of the universe framework?**

**Rick Rosner:** When we are talking about human tendencies, abilities, cognitive tendencies, abilities, and so on, we need some foundations. So, before we even get to that, there is a framework for this characterizing of human cognitive, ability, behavior, consequences, the everything is the optimum framework is bad.

That we are surely aware of it because human cognition is much more complicated and numerous. The preferred framework is narrative when we are communicating and people for thousands of years have done that through stories, which I like to describe as human behavior moving.

People who are characters are more or less familiar in stories. People are dying for those stories. Of course, the stories on TV in the 70s, or in my mind at least, are fake and not helpful. Their legacy is constrained by even talk of the day.

The action in movies is brutal compared to the past. We have all shows on TV now compared to one or a few in the past. It can be frivolous in describing some characters, most pronounced in characters who are not recognized for their complexity, but still, today's television is better.

Anyway, the narrative is the preferred framework for all these as opposes to equations, but, there is enough radio out there for telling stories. Most people prefer that over some silly mathematical characterization that gives a little insight into human cognition, in giving of evolutionary background or cultural support for some behaviors.

The cognition behind those behaviors. But the narratives simplify things. Humans have a pretty good ability not to screw up, but when people do try to become realistic about what humans are, someone gives optical statements about human beings.

It becomes human beings as basically bad or all good because of circumstances or innate capacities. We will make umbrella statements. If we do, it would be that humans have a certain level of churning out one area of cognition.

We are talking about humans who have some average level of violability or tendencies to yield to pressure. This is determined by evolution and cultural pressure. In some cases, it is a game theoretic deal.

How much money will it take to get somebody to slap on his screen? Who doesn't know it's coming? All those people would have an average level of resistance to an average price. Most people would yield to the temptation to be bad for the money.

So, human beings' resistances are worth a certain amount of money. So, we have a money equivalent to think of yourself as a good person. So, most people won't organize to strip something out of a kid's hands for five or ten bucks, probably not even twenty.

But at fifty, there may be some takers. At one hundred, probably, even more, where once at one thousand, you would probably get 80 to 90% of people. So, there game theoretic accelerations, what framework is there?

There is a money equivalent to feeling good about yourself. The feeling is that you are a good person, "I wouldn't do that." But at some point, the money equivalent of actual money is worth more than any good feelings someone might lose by slapping the ice cream, say, out of a kid's hands.

You probably still have a bad dynamic because of the number of cultural norms that behavior activation is based on evolution, culture, and some influences on the ability to think. There is a thing in high school football that coaches like to use, which is the two-minutes hang.

You make all the players hang for bars for two minutes; it's supposed to be a test of will and power. In that case, it gives theoretic desire to grow tough versus an example of the ability to focus your will as discomfort and pain rise.

So, that in the two-minutes hang situation: what percentage of players will be able to clearly take it for two minutes? You want to do a good job. It is the ability to focus versus wrecking your ability to focus, may be similar to holding breathe.

**Jacobsen: The feeling of pain and discomfort. The role, from your own perspective – as I am on the fence, of free will is in resistance to them. That it can be explained bottom up by a physics, but that narrative and personal feelings and certain reflections can be helpful in explanation of the world.**

**In your view, narrative descriptions of experience are heuristics, for what physics can alternately explain, but not practically explain given cognitive limitations or computational constraints of human beings. This ties back into a framework of consciousness in an information-based world.**

**Rosner:** Okay.

**Jacobsen:** Some aren't reasonable?

**Rosner:** What do you mean when you say we have different explanations between narrative descriptions and others?

**Jacobsen:** You can explain things hierarchically from the bottom up, where you have physics on the bottom explaining chemistry on up. Then you have the stories, the narratives that are simpler descriptions.

**Rosner:** So, you are saying we haven't built up from physics within reasonable expectations up to human behaviors?

**Jacobsen:** You've noted that you don't believe in freedom of the will. So, if our mind could explain the fundamental physical actions up into higher order structures such as beings, you could explain them completely.

**Rosner:** Let's start by saying, a lot of science will say everything mentioned out of physics. There is already modeling of the world in CG, where there is only CG. More and more lately, you can create stuff with actual physics equivalences.

Like waves and things, because the system is going to represent basic physics phenomena as if in the real world, there will be computer generated phenomena by making computer general. It could create life-like phenomena.

Physics in behavior. Life-like phenomena can come out of that, the sciences, chemistry, becomes one word: physics. Things in the world including chemical principles can be boiled down to the consequences of physical interaction, and biology is traced back to the bottom in physics with the hope that everything eventually will be vulnerable to description through the basic physical interactions of the universe.

**Jacobsen:** So, in that sense, our narratives of the willing of something through the pain and discomfort is simply a narrative perspective on what can also be explained mechanically. It may not be reasonable or necessary, but then it can be predictable – so no freedom of the will to you.

**Rosner:** You are able to deploy the other part of the brain. It's cognitive landscape, moment to moment, compels each subsequent part of the landscape, what you are thinking or feeling in every moment determines what you next think or feel.

It is subject to certain orders of limitation or acceleration, what you are thinking or feeling doesn't determine everything you are thinking or feeling in a subsequent problem. If you are thinking about the subsequent problem, somebody could slap you in the head, scrambling your processes.

Most people in most circumstances would be scrambled by that, what you're thinking or feeling plus your environment recreate sensory information. All those things working together determine what next you think or feel and what you next do as a consequence of those thoughts and feelings, which are themselves thoughts.

People with some experience as a football player for several years are going to possibly practice to practice better focus than an amateur or someone who has only been doing the footballing for a couple weeks.

The person who's experienced will have little processes that will allow for focus and the ability to deploy more fabulous forces to allow that person to aim or end more successfully better than a rookie.

**Jacobsen: There are two frameworks there. These two frameworks are apparently disparate but are associated directly or directly in contact to the nearest overlaying. One, the scaled physics-chemistry-biology-psychology framework, but then all grounded in physics.**

**The other one is narrative. Each has their merits. The narrative one describes by saying, "Rick turned to the left," or, "Rick turned to the right," or, "Rick took a drink of the coffee."**

**And those apparent choices are paired with descriptions of observing of the choices of another person. They come from the bottom, the scaling up model of physics or psychology. So, really, they're both valid because it's easier to tell a narrative structure for a complicated organism than it is to describe all particle interactions.**

**Rosner:** It is really a description of the world. It is more efficient in a way we can understand because we're understanding people by their narrative and drives; we understand each other to a grading term of basic human drives.

There is a principle that no matter how weird somebody is you can distill their accent, their thought. In fact, some base set of drives system in common with the rest humanity, even people that were monsters.

When they do something that is monstrous, generally, they base their actions, their monstrous actions, on a common drive; the desire that we all have. The 9/11 hijackers, when they find out who the guys were, they are always nerds.

Not much in a way of social success, no girlfriends, they work over there in something like engineering, have an Arabic background and are socially awkward because it is not the same culture; we've seen a lot of action of shooting guys.

All of that stuff can be traced back to the angry nerd bottom that went bad. They are bad guys. We can talk about badness. We are able to talk about people in terms of the will, to some extensive substantial characterization of people.

People's willpower can be boiled down to psychological forces which boiled down to biological forces which boiled down to chemical forces which boiled down to physical forces.

[End of recorded material]

# Ask A Genius 339 - Godspeed - God Willing Means God Fearing

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
November 22, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Cultural hypocrisies, some reasons for realism, and other for cynicism. Like the fear of God in the bedroom.**

**Rick Rosner:** God-fearing but at the same time everyone is looking at porn. So, even if modern and without revealing anything, it still says, “Look at my sexy curves.” There’s temptation. So, the trends around fear of God and temptation to sexuality will prevail for the next few centuries, two or three hundred years.

People will start doing more extreme body modifications: (a) because they are antisocial or (b) for compensated jobs. If you are working in a space, you want a body that is engineerable to be able to work in space.

If you are working underwater, you want a body that works in the water. But the traditional human forms are so powerful, are so deeply wired into us, that it will take centuries for us to regularly abandon those forms as a matter of choice.

So, people will still look like people in the year twenty-two-something. Though, they won’t look much like people you see in *Star Trek*; there is going to be a lot more weirdness, but it won’t be the full body abandonment weirdness until the twenty-three or twenty-four hundreds.

Since architecture is a construct based on the human form, for the most part, we live in buildings that are scaled to us, scaled to typical human bodies. We can imagine that architecture will similarly assume different forms.

Like some science fiction deal suggested that the entire human population will go from roughly six-feet tall to three-feet tall because, at that size, if you shrunk every body by fifty-percent we would only weigh one-eighth of what we do now.

If it was an exact shrinkage, we would probably want to keep big heads because heads are good for processing information. So, it wouldn’t be a straight one-eighth. Anyway, three-feet tall people consume a lot fewer resources.

Anyway, that might be a good place to stop because I am going to start speaking unproductively.

[End of recorded material]

## Ask A Genius 340 - Intelligence as Refuge and Strength

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner  
December 1, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** To take a step back, who are personal heroes for you although you have qualms with those terms?

**Rick Rosner:** Alright. Heroes, people I am interested in finding more about or reading more of their stuff.

**Jacobsen:** Like who?

**Rosner:** Like George Saunders, I would say is a hero. He is a guy who is trained as an engineer. Then became a writer who addresses a lot of issues of modern life that other people don't quite get. The world is discovered.

And so, he has rightfully elevated into one of our great current writers. He's also personally kind and available. He seems like a good guy. He is a great writer. Other writers I like, though their interests don't always overlap with mine – I mean entirely overlap with mine, so they don't always write about what I wish they would write about. Stevenson, Charles Straus, Doctorow, Kelly Oxford.

People I like finding more about include like Elvis. I like reading about F. Scott Fitzgerald, although he was a huge mess. A provocative mess. There's a whole little cluster of women at Harvard at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century who are responsible for much of our understanding of the structure of the universe.

They didn't get the credit they deserved. Like Henrietta Swan Leavitt and her crew. What's that lady, the one that discovered the elemental composition of stars? *Cecilia Helena Payne-Gaposchkin*.

She's interesting, in that she came up with this huge discovery and is almost entirely absent from our collective scientific memory. Compared to people whose names are pretty much household names, like Hubble -- who builds his work upon the work of these women.

I like reading about them, but there's not too much more to read about him. Oh, you asked who is smarter than me, and...

**Jacobsen:** Who do you think is smarter than you? There is the Betts listing.



**Rosner:** Everything has to start with how goofy the idea is that you can write about that way. I benefited from the ranking, but you have similar problems as to when you ask, and worse problems is when you ask, “Who is the world’s strongest man?”

There are lots of different indices of strength. And, any measuring tool is arbitrary in whatever tasks one picks or emphasizes. I can tell you that I have the highest measured IQ of anybody who has ever written jokes for TV.

**Jacobsen: In one interview, you said you had the highest IQ in the world.**

**Rosner:** I have worked with plenty of people who are wildly smart, who are geniuses accordingly, not the loosest definition of genius but not the strictest definition of genius, too. You have to put things in context where I might be the funniest person currently alive within an IQ in the 190s.

I might be the smartest person alive writing jokes like specific contexts. It’s hard to judge. Anyway, you were saying that I am the smartest person. I have got a good argument that I have the highest IQ in the world.

**Jacobsen: Second highest on the one listing. Dr. Katsioulis has the first. To your good argument for the highest, why? How?**

**Rosner:** I’ve taken more than thirty tests to measure ultra-high IQ and have gotten the highest score ever earned on more than twenty of them. Nobody has that huge record of maxing out all of these high-end IQ tests.

The most that anybody else has done is two or three or five. Where they get the highest score ever, if anybody would even doubt it’s high, I would think that other people’s claim to their IQ’s generally rest on one or two good performances on an IQ test.

Mine rests on my performance across dozens of tests. And decades of messing around with these tests.

**Jacobsen: And if you take the Betts listing, the one test that they do take into account to decide the score for number one was a nonverbal test by the Cerebrals Society. He scored 205 on an SD16.**

**It was a culture fair test. You scored 199 on SD16 on a verbal test.**

**Rosner:** I would have to look at the whole deal. These high-end tests get re-normed a lot. So, as the people who make the test get more results and do more statistical work, it can change things. Most of these people aren’t psychometricians or statisticians.

**Jacobsen: So, we can take this 199. Also, you scored four 198.1s all on tests by Betts from 2012. So, maybe, we can take a step back and that way you can speak more confidently.**

**Rosner:** I mean the everything is arbitrary. I have practiced a lot because I have taken so many tests. What it takes to do those tests, I have to put in the work to do them. So, you could argue that there is a huge practice effect and a huge determination in the diligence.

I mean everything is arbitrary, again, in the same way, that if you have ever watched the world's strongest man. You see a bunch of guys who weigh anyway from 280 to 400 pounds doing various things that take tremendous strength.

Lifting stone balls that are two feet in diameter, pushing 800-pound truck tires that are 10 feet in diameter end over end, racing while towing a semi that might go for 10,000 pounds, different people win different events.

There's no world's strongest man whose won that thing eight years in a row. I don't think, maybe there is. His name is probably something Scandinavian-like. Guys from the Viking country seem to be into this and do well.

But, that you can claim that any one of those guys is absolutely the world's strongest man, because the tasks are arbitrary. Then you have Olympic power holders who do things of strength and whole other sets of tightly judged measures of strength.

Then you have weird effects like the world's strongest teenager. For a long time, there was a kid out of one of the Eastern Bloc countries. This kid turns out that he has like brutal scoliosis. So, that when he deadlifts, he grabs the bar and spine flexes.

His rib cage drops a couple of inches. So, his ribs are resting directly on his ileac crest of his pelvis. And so, he only has to get the bar like two inches off the ground, because his body flexes. So, I've heard that when he bench-presses, then you can put a basketball under his back because his spine is so curved.

So, that's a weird way of not cheating but of leveraging one's strength due to anatomical peculiarity. The measurement of IQ, of intelligence, has always been problematic. And also, this is similar to the world's strongest man.

What the hell, it doesn't matter. What matters, the world's strongest man matters within the context of the show called *The World's Strongest Man*. It matters within the context of like national pride, which you could already use as an important thing when it comes to powerlifting.

I'm saying that the idea that IQ doesn't have a huge context of mattering, especially since IQ was designed in France by a guy as a tool to see what kids needed help with in school. He had IQ. He probably didn't call it IQ, because that was probably a term coined in California.

But he came up with the idea of intelligence testing, on a five-point scale, where the ones and twos had learning difficulties, needed help, the fours and fives had advanced learning abilities and needed perhaps different educational resources too.

The threes are your average students who might be in a regular classroom. Then Terman gets ahold of the idea and probably comes up with an index of 100 being average, with differences measured on a scale of the standard deviation of 16.

He Americanized it; he tech-ed it up. Going from a one through five scale to a scale that gives you a two or three-digit score, which gives the illusion of much more precision.

Anyway, I can brag about my IQ and use it to try to get recognition and maybe eventually a book deal or employment, or somehow monetize it the way like Marilyn Vos Savant, who was known for having the highest IQ in the *Guinness Book of World Records* in the 80s.

She has monetized her IQ. She has probably six or seven million dollars over her lifetime.

**Jacobsen: What's the evidence for that claim?**

**Rosner:** Because she has column in *Parade Magazine* for more than thirty years now. I am figuring if she gets 150 grand per year for the column, which, maybe she does, and she has published ten books.

If she is that active in giving speeches now, but she used to be part of the Speaker's Bureau, the woman with the world's highest IQ could come and talk to your group. Maybe, it will cost 15 or 20 grand.

So, I would say it's not unreasonable to think that given all of her activity that she has made at least millions of dollars off a career that began with her being celebrated for her IQ.

[End of recorded material]

## License and Copyright

### License



*In-Sight Publishing* and *In-Sight: Independent Interview-Based Journal* by Scott Douglas Jacobsen is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

Based on a work at [www.in-sightjournal.com](http://www.in-sightjournal.com).

### Copyright

© 2012-2018 by Scott Douglas Jacobsen and Rick Rosner, and *In-Sight Publishing* and *In-Sight: Independent Interview-Based Journal* 2012-2018. Unauthorized use and/or duplication of this material without express and written permission from this site's author and/or owner is strictly prohibited. Excerpts and links may be used, provided that full and clear credit is given to Scott Douglas Jacobsen and Rick Rosner, and *In-Sight Publishing* and *In-Sight: Independent Interview-Based Journal* with appropriate and specific direction to the original content.