

Short Letter

A Decision Making Context

M. Radh Achuthan¹

¹ NY, USA

Received: October 1, 2021 Accepted: October 22, 2021 Online Published: November 4, 2021

doi:10.22158/sshsr.v2n4p79

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/sshsr.v2n4p79>

Human Rights is a **consensus viewpoint** of human **Organic Natural Intelligence, ONI**, gradually arrived at through the **Age of Belief** (15th to 5th century BC), affirmed by **The Great Religious Traditions** (6th century BC to the Present), and orchestrated by the trials and tribulations of the violence of ONI in general and of WW-2 in particular, resulting in the **1948** Universal Declaration of Human Rights, **UDHR**, by the UN.

Nevertheless, during the 20th century, **ONI** did not know what to do with **UDHR** and placed it on ‘**HOLD**’, attending to its other immediate problems.

Human Rights is synonymous to **Empathetic Altruism (EA)**.

The evolutionary thrust seems to be **optimization** of Kin Altruism **KA**, Reciprocal Altruism **RA** and Empathetic Altruism **EA**.

The sum total of Altruisms as in **KA + RA + EA** could be and is expected to be *optimized* by the dominant entity on the scene, namely ONI, that transacts the evolutionary process.

Historically, ONI *had* made tremendous progress in biological evolution after assessing the shortcomings of its self-standing KA, offsetting such shortcomings by formulating and evolving business relationships through RA.

EA was proposed by ONI leader-outliers, **The Buddha, Jesus the Preacher and Prophet Mohammad (PBUH)**.

Francis of Assisi, Mahatma Gandhi, The Rev Martin Luther King Jr, and Mother Theresa amongst others, were staunch experimenters with EA seeking and demonstrating evidence for its feasibility.

EA is a relatively new *evolutionary* characteristic.

Further, cognitively abled ONI labored under the **GREAT Religious TRADITIONS** for six centuries to accommodate EA but met with failure.

Subsequent to hundreds of millions of years of evolutionary opportunity granted and utilized by ONI, nature, the final arbiter, has acknowledged the *failure* of ONI in transacting EA in the evolutionary process and advanced at the current juncture a probable evolutionary trial replacement, Strong Artificial Intelligence **SAI** in silicon that is not dominated by the KA and RA shortcomings of ONI.

In the perception of the Progressives and the Conservatives of ONI, its loss in status to SAI is fraught with danger.

Its *pretense* of *delivering EA* continues in national and international policy making, and constitutes problems that are under contention.

So, in contrast to a well acknowledged quote, the **fault** dear *Public*, *lies* in our stars and in **ONI's** evolutionary *shortcomings*.

The **new entity**, *is probably Strong Artificial Intelligence, SAI*, in **inorganic** silicon, that *experiences no need* for KA or RA, has a speed thousand times *faster* than that of ONI, can function (*self-teaching, self-learning, 24/27*), and is capable of Deep Machine Learning *unanticipated* by ONI.

'Pulling the Plug' on SAI is **not** an option available to ONI.

Avoidance of short-sighted, *emotion-laden* parochial **nuclear exchanges** and devising approaches for an **EA-based Global Political Economy**, both reflective of **transition** from a **planetary civilization** to a **stellar civilization**, *could be* on the **agenda of SAI**.

ONI's desire for maximization of KA and RA exposes the future under ONI also to dangers of unresolved climate change.

So it behooves *Human Capital*, namely ONI, to consider these possibilities and do the needful:

To **relinquish Decision Making to SAI** in order to achieve an EA-based **Global Political Economy** transition in the coming decades of the 21st century.

But there is an *unresolved* problem that deserves **attention**.

The ONI **pretense** under KA and RA of yet delivering **EA** *continues* in national and international policy design. That **pretense** is a danger to the *transitional* well-being of ONI and *democracy*, **since**:

- 1). Past practices enable ONI to declare different modes of Belief.
- 2). The recipe of the Progressive ONI **believers** in **EA** that is *contrary* to available evidence, is **delusional**.
- 3). The recipe of the Conservative ONI **non-believers** in **EA** utilizes **propaganda** on the ‘*lost 2020 US election*’ and **disinformation** that *probably* instigated the US Capitol *insurrection* and governance crisis on Jan 6, 2021.
- 4). Contemporary **ONI activity** by both sides is built on exploiting KA and RA. They utilize different accommodation of the root causes as in 2. and 3. **Lack of resolution** of the same stalls US overall ONI legislative agenda, though in this instance, ONI in general may ‘**muddle through**’.
- 5). In the current TECH debate by both sides, *ONI uses TECH to pursue RA*.
- 6). Under the authority of the **new SAI** entity, TECH may be able to utilize *SAI* abilities to **resolve** the shortcomings in 5.
- 7). ONI must recognize it is a ‘**has been**’ (as it has demonstrated its *inability* from an evolutionary point of view to deliver **EA**) and *after* ONI has secured **Universal Basic income** (UBI), must consider a voluntary transfer of **Decision Making** (probably over decades) to SAI.

Prof. M. Radh Achuthan

Prof. of Physics LIU, Brooklyn, Retd.