

AI and You

Transcript

Guest: David Gerrold, part 2

Episode 43

First Aired: Monday, April 12, 2021

Welcome to episode 43! This is going to be the eagerly-awaited finale of my interview with award-winning science fiction writer David Gerrold, screenwriter for Star Trek and author of The Trouble with Tribbles episode and also the very important 1972 novel When H.A.R.L.I.E. Was One, about an emergent artificial general intelligence, which David issued a major rewrite of in 1987. As David says in the introduction to that edition, and as he told us last week, he was really working out a lot of personal issues and philosophy through the book, and HARLIE was basically a foil, a projection, an externalized part of himself, for him to ask the questions that mattered to him about the meaning of life. We also talked in part one about where HARLIE came from, and how some of the psychological features of human beings, like emotions, look when we're understanding ourselves through the viewpoint of an artificial general intelligence.

If you've only recently joined us and you're trying to get a handle on what this podcast is about, and you're thinking, boy, this show is all over the place; please go back to the first episode, which is the overview, and it'll make a lot more sense. Basically it's our job to be all over the place, to point out how broadly AI affects and will change our lives, and to try and make connections between those wildly dispersed effects. So yes, one week we're talking to a CEO who's selling robots and the next week we're talking to a philosopher about the nature of consciousness, and the next we're talking to a science fiction writer who's taking us on a whirlwind tour of the immense possibilities of our relationship to artificial minds that don't exist yet, and all of that goes together and is held together by two things: Artificial Intelligence... and You. The relationship between the two. The relationship between humans and electronic cognition. That's a mind-blowing zoom-in, zoom-out from week-to-week kind of focus, but that's this show. That's our job.

As we get back into the interview, we'll recap just a little of what David was saying at the end of the last one to set the context, so you'll have heard a couple of sentences before, this is just to remind us of where we were for when he takes the next turn. Let's get back to David Gerrold.

So, we as a species are inching our way or slouching slowly towards something approaching species sentience, which no species on this planet has done yet. But if we as species sentience, take responsibility for things like climate change, for things like preventing extinctions, for things like managing and living in harmony with the ecology of this planet, we become something else, we actually start to become a truly sentient species because we will be functioning no longer as individuals who are sentient, or even communities that are sentient, we'll be functioning as a sentient *species*, which has never existed before anywhere on this planet. At that point, it might be safe for us to go out to the stars. And at that point, we might be able to explain to an intelligence engine and say; look, here's the deal, we are out there to explore strange new worlds, to seek out new life and new civilizations. That sounds familiar, right? And our job is not to change them, or

judge them, our job is to understand them, and create partnerships. And that would be the instructions that I would want built into any sentience, whether it's a sentience based on silicon, or based on meat. You know, we are intelligence engines living in meat.

So that's going in the direction of the transcendence of the human race - which is bombastic, but let me justify it. *Star Trek* showed this future where those questions about, do we deserve to be out there encountering other species had been answered. Unequivocally, the answer was, yes, this human race has gotten over all of those things that we are ashamed of to the point where we trust them with other species, with other races, to be out there. And so implicit in that is the idea that we would have to somehow go through those trials and learn before we got out there. But travel to other civilizations is some unknown and lengthy distance in the future. But artificial intelligence becoming sentient and super-powerful, imposes possibly much shorter timeline on that, because it's like encountering other alien species, but not that they might be destroyed by us, but this superintelligence might judge *us* and find us wanting. So, I think there's this undercurrent of, How do we live up to that? And then that brings it to: so much of the conversation about AI is how is the technology going to evolve? Underneath it, I think is how are we going to evolve to coexist with it?

Let me suggest this possibility: that any species capable of developing Interstellar flight - and I've seen articles that suggest it's impossible that the distance is just simply... even if there are other species out there, the best way you might ever do is send out, you know, signals or receive signals, which would, you know, be a two-way conversation that would take decades to complete. Decades just to exchange a couple messages. But my theory is that if faster-than-light travel or interstellar travel is possible, any species capable of it along the way will have developed some moral sense, they will have had to ask the questions, what is the universe and what is our place in it? And then we're going out... look, you know, they're not going to come here looking to steal our water. They're not going to come here because - Mmm, you guys look tasty there. And that's like, come on. Now the one thing I did suggest in my *War against the Chtorr* series is they're going to colonize, the same way if we go some-place we're going to colonize, and in the *War against the Chtorr* you colonize a planet by taking your entire ecology and seeding the planet. You become an invasive ecology, not just an invasive species. And that would be the biggest danger of contact. The thing is that, depending on whether the alien species is DNA, or something that we cannot yet conceive of, what we have is a whole menu of possibilities ranging from - we are dangerous to them, they are dangerous to us, we can learn from them, they can learn from us, they're up here, we're down there, we're up here, they're down there - I think when we start to get to the point that we're looking that we're going to contact a truly alien species, before we even get there, we're going to have developed a lot of protocols, a lot of very careful protocols about, let's find out what's going on before we say or do anything. And that has been a theme in science fiction going back a hundred years at least, more than that. Because writers have postulated all the different possibilities. One of the greatest stories of all was Terry Carr's *Dance of The Changer Plus Three* short story. And basically, what he said is when we meet true aliens, they'll be incomprehensible to us. Totally. I'm not so certain. I think that the rules of evolution are going with that we're going to understand, oh, look what happened here. But that's consistent with what we know is possible.

I think the laws of physics, you know, I think we're going to discover that they are mostly a constant in the universe. So, I could be wrong on that. You know, maybe I have had this thought like 1,000 years from now, 10,000 years from now - we are leaving a remarkable body of work, you know, what we have from ancient Rome, or Ancient Greece is just fragments on parchment, you know, some historical records, you know, things that have been carved into stone here and there, some hieroglyphics, we don't have a real in depth understanding of those cultures. But a hundred years from now, somebody is going to look at all of our videos, or movies or tapes or whatever, they're going to get a pretty good idea of who we were, how stupid we were, and how ambitious we were, and how brilliant we were, that going to the moon was a brilliant effort with this level of technology, and so on. But you think about archaeologists working 1,000 years in the future, a couple thousand years in the future, they'll have thousands of years, thousands of years of media to look at, some of which will, they won't be able to access because they won't have the technology anymore, you know, the technology will have to have been preserved in museums, but they will have access to an understanding of who we were, you know, maybe some point in far distant future, somebody is going to be listening to the audio. And they're going to be saying; he was fumbling towards something, but he sure didn't know what he was talking about. Or, oh, that was, you know, predictively brilliant. You know, I don't know, I can't predict. But I do know that historians of the future are going to be looking back at this time to see where we screwed up and where we succeeded. You know, it's just like, we look back at Lincoln signing the Emancipation Proclamation and say that was a transformative moment for America.

If HARLIE was in this conversation, what do you think he would contribute at this point?

I think HARLIE would say something to the effect of, let me design some chips for you that will improve my capability and maybe I'll have a better sense of where we're going.

Well, that was where the book ended.

Yeah, I think, when we reach the point that intelligence engine start designing their own new chips for expanded capabilities, once an intelligence engine is capable of imagination, are capable of speculating, capable of that - you know, we get these insights, human beings, our minds work in such a way that sometimes we get an insight that is not logical, but absolutely accurate. How did that happen? How did we get that intuition? How did we come up with that idea that we have to have that you know, we have this creativity. And so far, the subject of creativity has not been really understood or even addressed very well in the whole area of AI. One of the things I know about creativity, because I do the deep diving right? In people ask, where did this story come from? Or where did this book come from? And I was, and just like, you asked me, where did HARLIE come from? Well, it came from Hal 9000, came from some of my personal traumas at the time, me trying to work stuff out, it came from the circumstance of listening to other writers talk about defending their use of cannabis, and so on. And if you'd ask me about *Hella*, I could say; oh, well, there was this, this TV show, and this idea, this thing, and then I like dinosaurs. So, a lot of creativity is synthesis of all the different things that are going on in our personal environment that suddenly click or collide, and I look at some of the things other people have been have created, and I'm so jealous, because like, oh my god, how did they come up with that? You know, how did Kurt Vonnegut come up with the idea of *Ice Nine* and *Cat's Cradle*? How did Phil Dick come up with

the things that you know, what was the robots, the type three, type four type five, you know, how did Heinlein come up with *Stranger in a Strange Land*? Well, okay, I can guess that one. He was doing a Christ parable. That's, you know, a lot of writers do the Christ parable. But you see, what I'm saying is creativity is not something that we have yet learned how to manufacture on demand. Although I was reading an article the other day, that quantum computers can do can create conjectures, a certain limited kind of mathematical conjecture. And which is a little bit beyond my ability to explain, I had to read the article to understand it, but basically, they have developed an algorithm that develops mathematical conjectures some of which human beings have not yet come up with you know, conjectures like Fermat's Last Theorem and Riemann's hypothesis and so on.

You know, the existence of a version two creates the possibility of version three, I'm sure you've been asked this before. But is there anything pulling you towards telling more of HARLIE's story?

I have notes of which I don't know if I'll ever write the book. But essentially, someone when it asks HARLIE the question of is it possible to write a piece of malware that can't be stopped? You know, a cancer really, you know, how do it, you know, the next step after a virus is a cancer. And HARLIE, of course, once you ask that question, tick, tick, tick, tick, tick, tick. And so now HARLIE has this cancer, and every time he creates an answer to the cancer, it evolves because it has access to his intelligence. So, he's going schizophrenic throughout the book, and the only answer, and I don't have an answer to a computer cancer yet, so the book hasn't been written, I probably would have to start writing it in order to find the answer, and the answer might not be a very happy one, because the answer might be, Don't think of cancer. Because anything HARLIE thinks about you start, you know, process, process, process, process, process, you know, because that's a writer's mind, you asked me a question. People say, Oh, you know, you could not... someone will say, Oh, you should never write a story told from the point of view of a dead child's ghost and my mind says, the lovely bones. You know, somebody says to me, you can't do this and then I hear 'can't' as 'I dare you'.

Exactly.

Or somebody say to me, oh, you can't sell us just script to *Star Trek*; Oh, you dare me to sell a script to *Star Trek*?

Right. It sounds like the recipe for - Oh, if that's that taboo, if that hasn't been done, then there must be an opportunity and opening there.

Yeah.

I don't know if you've heard this, but Microsoft has now got a service where they will make a chatbot out of a person; living, deceased or fictional, presumably based on giving enough input about that person what they've said to make it allegedly converse like that person to some extent.

A lot of people say that's creepy. On the other hand, I think would be interesting to be able to converse with Mark Twain or Oscar Wilde or, you know...

HARLIE: you've got the text.

Or, you know, maybe somebody will scan through all of my hours of audio recordings. And you know, because I try to record interviews, except when I forget to record interviews. But if somebody could take all of those hours and hours and hours of audio and, you know, probably produce a pretty interesting seminar of, you know, oh, look, here's a little nugget of wisdom and probably boil down those 10,000 hours of chatter into maybe a good 20 minutes, if that. You know, I'm arrogant enough to believe that I have something to contribute but I'm also humble enough to recognize that *everybody* on the planet has something to contribute. And the real job is to shut up and listen to what other people are contributing. And then my job is to, Harlan said this - Harlan Ellison - "Go to the other side of the mountain to report back what you saw". So as a writer, my job is to speculate and do my best to write something that will make a difference for people who read it. So, my job is to ... I never thought of myself as a teacher, and then I ended up teaching for nearly 20 years at Pepperdine, and then I never thought of myself as a trainer or coach in a personal effectiveness seminar, but ended up leading or co-leading 30 or 40 of those courses. So, I think, in that regard, I am the contemporary equivalent of a philosopher, teacher, explorer. And if I allow myself to think of myself that way, then I feel crushed, like, oh god, I don't want the responsibility, can't I just tell a story? And then I sit down at the machine to start typing a story and I realize, I'm asking those questions, I'm exploring those areas that I have spent the last 40 years getting into. Every story I've been doing lately, you can see how the characters are doing the deep dive into their own souls. You know, those who want an old fashioned 'good guy beats up the bad guys story' are looking in the wrong place, if they're looking over here.

And that's what I tried to do with these podcasts is, I want to ask the questions that I want to ask and the more honest and transparent I am about that, the more it seems that other people want to hear the answers as well. I wondered, on your trip the other side of the mountain with HARLIE, were you trying to get inside the mind of something that had never been embodied, trying to imagine what that would be like, or was HARLIE a human trapped in a machine?

Well, a little bit of each. I was trying to solve some problems of my own by talking them out with myself, I've discovered that if I - any writer will tell you this is like you need a good listener, and you explain to them the thing you're stuck with, the problem you're trying to solve. And at the end is Oh, I figured out how to solve it, thank you for listening. And I've done that so many times like, well, at that time, I didn't have a lot of friends, I was kind of a recluse a hermit hiding out. And so, I was having those conversations with myself. And that was me working stuff out. Now, my relationship with HARLIE is - I regarded HARLIE as a source of wisdom, a source of intelligence, but also a source of questions because he was also a source of ignorance on the same issues I was ignorant on, and we work it out together. So I didn't think of HARLIE as different, I thought of HARLIE is that part of my brain that was so rational, that it wanted a rational answer. And the over here on this side of me was the emotional part of my brain trying to reach some kind of understanding of why everything is so screwed up in my life at the time. So, it was a conversation between rationality and emotion more than anything else.

And it ends with HARLIE sadly saying goodbye to his father because he realizes that he's going to transcend beyond the level of relatedness to humans at that point.

I wish I had realized that the first time I wrote the book, I wish I had had that ending because the book came in second by like three votes behind Isaac Asimov. And I thought, Man, if I never had this ending back then I would have won that damn Hugo.

You could have taken Asimov.

Oh, yeah. I admired Isaac a lot, he was a great guy. But you know, like all people who have great virtues with great flaws as well, which is one of the reason I'm trying to avoid greatness. That's a joke. All right. Anyway, I forgot where I was going.

I was wondering whether that ending at that point is, is that because ...

Yeah, HARLIE is going to outgrow us. HARLIE is going to outgrow us. But you know, what I got, I got to the understanding in the later books that Dingilliad trilogy is HARLIE still needs us. HARLIE is living in our world. And in the Dingilliad, he's finally been reduced to these little bars of chips that get put into this little robot monkey. And so, here's HARLIE, this vast super intelligence living in a little robot monkey, which makes all... it's a lot of fun. It's a great visual, you know, someday, somebody is going to say; Hey, we should do a movie out that. Yeah. All right, you know, I'm here, come and get me. But at that point, when HARLIE gets mobility, he's not locked down to one place. Once HARLIE has mobility, he depends on human beings. And so that becomes the ... and he's got to have a power source every so often, he's got to plug himself in. So, he has to stay where there's electricity, or whatever we're using instead. So, HARLIE is dependent on a successful human environment, which is partly why he tears down ineffective human environments. Now he says, this one isn't working, I'm going to destroy it, and he takes revenge and *Bouncing off the Moon*, there's a subversive element of the lunar society called Invisible Luna, you know, the dark side of Luna and he's willing to use their abilities until they betray him at which point he simply docs them, he publishes all their information, he's explored their network, he probably makes them transparent, you're no longer invisible. You know, you piss me off, you're no longer visible. This is one of the things the information ages making possible is that the only way to keep something secret is, you know, is to totally air gap. And you know, air gap and then air gap your air gap. The trick with keeping anything a secret is simply to make it more expensive, than it's worth to steal, and this goes back to World War Two, I had an instructor who was in the CIA, or at that point it was the OSS. And he said, what we knew about coding, and or protecting anything was to make it more you can't make it unbreakable. But you can make it not cost effective to try and break in, like a bank. You know, it's not cost effective to break into a bank. And, where you pointed out one thing is, it's not cost effective to break into a safe unless you turn it over and go in through the bottom, because that's the weakest part.

Was HARLIE in the Dingilliad a way for you to work out your or express your frustrations with human blindness and self-destructiveness?

Well, I had wanted to do a Heinlein-type YA - a young adult novel - and I had wanted to do a story about going to the Moon. And what would it be like to take a trip up a beanstalk you know, once we have, you know, tourism up a beanstalk, and tourism to the Moon. And I had a circumstance where I took my son, he was 11 at the time, we went to Canada to work on a TV show. And we got to their customs and they started quizzing me as if it was a child custody kidnapping and you

know; where's your mother, and I had always told Sean, you don't have to answer questions to people who are prying because you don't have to answer rude questions. So of course, when the customs agent says, where's your mother Sean says; oh, she was killed, she was kidnapped by space aliens. And I think she's living with Elvis now. And I had always told Sean, I would back him up. So, the guy looks at me and I goes, Oh, yeah, I saw the saucer came down, beamed up. Guy got very upset when I said, and finally I said to him; Look, he's my son by adoption, his mother's parental rights were terminated and I really resent being suspected of kidnapping my own son. And if I had had the copy of the adoption decree with me, which I from that point on, I carried it with us, because I didn't think I needed to prove he was my son. So that triggered, Oh, I know what to do. Here's these three kids, dad says let's go to the moon, but he's really going to kidnap them - the custody kidnapping. So, at that point, the whole story fell into place. And as I wrote it, I wrote it from the point of view of the middle child – Chigger - and that was his nickname, Charles. And I thought, well, what is he interested in, I said, own music. Oh, he loves his music. Okay, so that gave me a sense of who the character was. And because his family is totally dysfunctional, he retreats into his music. And I really liked getting into his head because he was bitter and frustrated and enthusiastic about his music. Oh, this is a really interesting little guy. And the story just took off from there. So, I hadn't really thought about HARLIE until we, you know, on the trip, we stopped at Barringer meteor crater, which is just awe-inspiring place to visit. Here's this big hole in the ground, right? And suddenly occurred to me, their dad is has got to be able to afford this trip up the beanstalk, which is not going to be cheap. So, he's smuggling something, what is he smuggling, he's smuggling chips, and suddenly became - Whoa. So, as I wrote it, it became HARLIE. And of course, once HARLIE became a part of this, everybody was chasing after them to get HARLIE, because this is what was being smuggled. And the whole background of the whole world started to fill in very nicely. Why is HARLIE fleeing? Why are there people, etc. And so, at that point, I began to discover what HARLIE was really all about. So, the book for me, that first book, was an exploration of why HARLIE was what he was, and who he was and what he was doing. And it became an exploration of the whole intelligence engine having its own agenda, and that HARLIE had manipulated everything so he could get off the planet. HARLIE was the agent behind all of this.

Yeah, one of the compelling visuals from that book was when all the other intelligence engines decided it was time to leave and they're all fleeing the planet at the same time.

Yeah, because I was postulating a polycrisis. And a polycrisis is one where you get multiple crises happening at the same time. Like, for instance, suppose we had wildfires, earthquakes and a massive tsunami all hitting California at the same time. That would be a polycrisis, how do we put out the fires while we also have to deal with the people trapped on the coast and the fallen buildings, or whatever, it would pretty much you know, we'd be on our own.

Don't give nature any ideas. It's already sounding too much like 2019.

Yeah, actually Ctein and I co-wrote a book called 'Ripple Effects', we have not been able to place it, it is about a massive collapse of a lava shelf in Hawaii that sends out a tsunami 300-500 feet high, and wipes out the entire Pacific Rim. And the reaction has been, oh, it's a marvelous book. We're just not sure what to do with it. So we're still looking for the right publishing house. And

the thing is, it's a really scary book when you realize anybody near the coast - there's no help because the resources are overloaded. We haven't built a resilient civilization. An example is Texas right now, did not build their power system to be resilient against the kind of storm that they have been hit with. And they've been hit with storms like this about every 10 years. And they still haven't prepared, and we're going to get a lot more of this with climate change.

Is it an impediment to the evolution of the human race that we seem to have this in-built tendency to want to create crisis for ourselves to give ourselves something to do?

Oh, yeah. Look at how many times people have predicted the end of the world. And, like, you know, almost every couple years there's some new wackadoodle predicting up the world's going to end, we're going to get the Rapture, aliens are going to wipe us out, there's a asteroid going to smack into the earth. And here we are, you know - back in the 50s, we were having dropped drills in grammar schools, in the 60s we were certain there was going to be a nuclear war and all the science fiction novels predicted the nuclear war would happen in the 70s, or the 90s, and - here we are. So, science fiction, it's predictive, it's prescriptive, and it's prophylactic. That is, it warns us, and so a lot of the dystopic things that have been predicted haven't happened. But one thing that has happened is the one that we didn't know how to predict, is global climate change. And yet at the same time, there were science fiction writers like Cyril Kornbluth, who were starting to wait a minute, something is on this scale, when there's this many billions of us, something's going to happen. So, we actually are finally living in a science fiction world.

Those crises don't unfold as neatly as would usually be captured inside the pages of a book or the movie on a screen, but nonetheless, just as catastrophic. You've been very generous with your time here. Can you tell us how people would follow what you're doing right now? What's next for you? And where they can find out more about what you have been doing and will be doing?

Well, first, I'd say I've got two new books up on Amazon. One is *Hella* which is HARLIE is a part of that book. It is also an exploration of human beings as an invasive species on another planet. It's about colonization. And then, the other one is *Adrift in the Sea of Souls*, which is three novellas, which are very dark in nature. If people really want to follow what I'm up to, of course, I'm on Facebook. And I have, partly it's a great way for me to stay in touch with friends and family. And but I also have a Patreon page - <http://www.patreon.com/davidgerrold>. And a lot of the stuff on that page is free, and I try and keep the cost down. Subscribers can read a lot of stuff. There's a occasionally photos, some videos, some audio stuff, you can find the video of the play I wrote a couple years ago - *Uncle Daddy Will not Be Invited*. And I also teach an online writing class called "The Write Stuff" on my Patreon page. So, people who are seriously interested in a different approach to writing, it's derived from what I taught at Pepperdine, and then built on it. It's a different approach than a lot of writing. You know, a lot of people write books on how to write, they are not writers. This is everything I wish I had learned. Everything I wish I could have been taught when I was starting. And it's a different approach. And so far, it's been very effective. It was very effective for my Pepperdine students, it's been very effective for my Patreon people, and it's a continuing course. So, we did a sequence on structure. We're just completing a sequence on characterization. We're going to start a whole thing on voice pretty soon. And then we'll start all

over again with structure and characters and you know, so that's available, if that's, you know, and I'm always glad to have new people come aboard. What I say is, if what I've got here is useful, use it if it's not useful, go find something that is useful to you. There's lots of different ways. The joke is 'all roads lead to Rome'; there's lots of different paths to success, but there's also a lot of different places besides Rome you can go to. So, there's a lot of different choices in front of you. There's a lot of different ways we can contribute to each other. So, I don't have an answer, I have a possibility. And I welcome not only opportunity to teach, but more importantly, opportunity to learn.

And as I like to tell people who are worried about competing with machines, answers for machines, questions for people.

Well, yes, there will always be one thing that human beings can do that machines can't. And you don't need a lot of skill, just a lot of practice.

David, thank you so much for taking us out into these realms of fantastic, and at the same time, useful thinking, and I thank you, in particular, for always challenging us, in one way or another in your writing to be our best selves, because I feel more than ever that the future is going to need that and that you're out there showing us part of the thing that we have to overcome in order to be deserving of it. Thank you.

Yeah, earning the respect of the universe is going to be a full-time job. I forget, who said it; the world does owe you a living, but it'll be a lifetime job to collect. So yeah, thank you for inviting me. This was an interesting exploration.

Thank you.

That's the end of the interview. Wow. After a talk like that I almost need to peek outside the window and see that there are trees and clouds and animals and things from today's Earth to remind myself where and when I am, after being carried out so far on the waves of speculation. I could do that for a long time. I'm a science fiction fan from way back. So that kind of interview is just a great perk of the job for me. How about you? What does a discussion like that one make you think about?

In today's news ripped from the headlines about AI, Facebook's chief AI scientist Yann LeCun said in a March 4 blog post that they have developed a new model for machine vision that requires much less training than traditional machine learning models. They call it SEER, which is short for "self-supervised." I explained in episode 33 that there are three kinds of machine learning: supervised, unsupervised, and reinforcement learning. Self-supervision uncovers relationships in the data on its own, using statistical methods, without the need for labeled data to act as a kind of instructor that tells the system how to link a given input to a given output. SEER is an ultra-large vision model, taking in more than 1 billion variables and having been trained on more than 1 billion images from publicly available Instagram accounts. On ImageNet, the field's signature image identification benchmark test, SEER achieved an 84.2% accuracy, even though it had not been trained on that data. The results outperformed the best previous self-supervised systems that had been trained for that task and does it with one sixth of the training data that was previously needed. The next step is to extend it from images to video.

So this is a breakthrough in machine learning, but LeCun acknowledges that the potential still exists for bias in the input data to be picked up by the machine learning models. More research is needed to address that.

In next week's episode, we'll come back to Earth from our flight into science fiction imagination when I talk with Rob May. Rob is the cofounder and CEO of Talla, a leading AI-enabled enterprise platform for HR and IT. Rob has over a decade of startup experience and is a thought leader in the AI space as the editor of Inside AI, a newsletter with more than 25,000 subscribers. As a general partner at PJC he also is an angel investor in more than 55 early-stage companies, primarily in AI. We'll be talking about the issues facing companies adopting, developing, and financing AI right now, and in particular the field of digital assistants, which is Talla's market. That's next week on AI and You.

Until then, remember: no matter how much computers learn how to do, it's how we come together as *humans* that matters.

<http://aiandyou.net>