

# AI and You

Transcript

Guest: Rob May, part 1

Episode 44

First Aired: Monday, April 19, 2021

Hey, welcome to episode 44. Today's guest is Rob May. He is a General Partner at PJC, which is an early-stage venture capital firm focused on investing in, supporting, and building relationships with entrepreneurs who are creating the future. His expertise is in the areas of AI, hardware, B2B, and Software-as-a-Service. Before joining PJC, Rob was the co-founder and CEO of Talla, an AI and automation platform, transforming the way businesses deliver customer support. He was also the co-founder and CEO of Backupify, the world's first cloud-to-cloud backup. As an angel investor, he made over 70 early-stage AI investments. Rob writes the world's most popular newsletter on artificial intelligence – InsideAI. I strongly recommend that newsletter, you can pick up a lot of the kind of news that I talk about in the show's headline segment.

You may feel a little whiplash after last week's journey into the far reaches of space and imagination with science-fiction author David Gerrold. I wanted to talk with Rob because he's grounded in what's happening with AI in the most down-to-earth, here-and-now arena of finance, and I wanted to know, what people whose money is on the line think about the state of AI commercialization right now.

I'm not swinging from one extreme of AI to the other to play with your heads... not that I'm above that sort of thing, but it's to illustrate just how much territory AI covers, how it permeates and penetrates every part of our lives. Andrew Ng said that "AI is the new electricity," and that gets at why all these wildly different topics we're doing all work, because, think about how electricity is in everything now, from TVs to computers to street lights to factories to trains – when we look at these things we don't even see the electricity for the most part, we just see the train or the light or the TV or whatever, we don't think, "Hey, another stunning application of electricity, look at those electrons go!" The electricity has become part of the background, an assumed part of nearly everything, but none of those things from satellites to smart phones would be possible without it. If Ng is right, we're at the beginning of a transition to AI being as ubiquitous a part of everything as electricity.

Which gives us a pretty broad mandate for this show. What does it mean to think about the world having AI as pervasive as electricity? That's incredible. Is it impossible? We might as well have fun trying.

Someone else who has fun trying to think about that is Rob May. So let's get into the interview with him.

Rob May, welcome to the show. It's a pleasure to have you on.

Yeah, glad to be here, thanks for having me.

So you have done a lot of things with artificial intelligence, and venture capital, and investing, and yet you started as an engineer. You were at Harris Corporation designing graphics processing, processing chips for the Comanche helicopter. And that kind of background - I work a lot with engineers, and they don't often end up doing what you are doing with investment as

a career and senior management roles. How did that transition happen for you? And how do those two fields, for you, provide insights for each other?

Well, when I started, I was an FPGA and ASIC designer primarily, in a time when people didn't care a lot about chips. In the early 2000s, everything was in software, but there were a lot of still chips for military and space applications that we were building. And so it was a lot of fun, but I always was a little more maybe of a systems thinker than your average engineer, right? It's like, your engineering is a process of taking a problem and breaking it down into smaller, smaller parts until you know how to solve one of those parts, and then building those back up. And I love that mindset, and I really loved engineering, and I still occasionally write some code for fun or play around with new programming languages. I'd actually like to get back into doing some hardware, but for me, I was really drawn to the ambiguity of business problems, right? If I was trying to figure out something about a circuit, I could simulate it both ways, and see which way is better. But when you're building a company, and you hire somebody, you don't know what would have happened if you'd hired somebody different. I mean, you could have a really great outcome. And maybe you would have had an outcome that was even twice as great if you'd hired the other person, you don't know. And I found that interesting, so I was always drawn to that. And I've always been a little more of a complex systems thinker. And I think more about the relationship between things than the things themselves, so less about the properties of a unit and more about the relationship between the unit, and I think it's what drew me to AI, and I think that's what drew me to venture capital.

And so you're talking about complexity, and I saw on your profile that you are interested in machine learning and brain-machine interfaces, as part of that. Just as a side question, are you getting into anything with brain-machine interfaces yet, or is it too early?

Well, PJC which is where I'm a partner, we're investors in a company called Neurable, and Neurable is building a brain-machine interface. There are a couple of people that are doing it. It's tough to do, and there's a bunch of ways to do it, right? The skull does not pass electromagnetic signals very well. And so to read what is inside the skull is difficult without doing something invasive, like drilling a hole in your head or something, which we don't want to do. And so a lot of people have taken the approach of, "Well, can you use machine learning to take these attenuated signals from the skull out and tell what they what people really thinking"? But it's tough. I won't go into Neurable's sort of secret sauce, but they have to use a bunch of different things to sort of get you to figure out what you're paying attention to, and sort of what you're thinking, and what you're trying to control.

It's got enormous upside potential for a killer app, down the road. We just don't know how long that road is, but the potential for some kind of communication between the brain and the computer. It's not going to start out like telepathy, but anything that provides an interface that lets me control things faster, could potentially be a game-changer. Is anything close enough to be worth throwing money at?

Well, I think Neuralink is interesting. One of the guys, when Elon Musk started that company, one of the guys that he hired was a guy that I actually knew who was a professor here at Boston

University. And I'd had lunch with the guy before just to talk about some of this stuff; and his area of expertise was simulating, using light waves for brain-machine interfaces. So one of the problems is people typically use electrodes, they put them in your brain, drill a hole in your head, put them in your brain, they move around a little bit, your body attacks them. It's much easier to make some of these little tubes that can pass light out of materials that are closer to biological materials. And if you can get them to stimulating certain areas of the brain using light waves, then it's a very different approach than what a lot of people have tried. And so, my assumption since he hired Tim to go there is that's probably some of what they're working on, so that sounds promising.

But is it starting to come now out of the realm of pure research; university departments that are dependent upon government grants, and into the private sector where there's some kind of return on investment expected down the road?

Yeah, what I think people are thinking about it initially, for you know, simple monitoring things about the brain. I'm an investor in a company called Beacon Biosignal, and they have a very simple thing that they can slap on your forehead. Well, it turns out if you go to the hospital, and, and you have a disease or a problem, where your brainwaves are the best way to tell that you have that problem, the doctors don't like to do that, except as a last resort. They like to run a lot of other tests first, and the reason they like to do the other test first is that it's a big pain in the butt to come and bring an EEG machine in and hook it up to your scalp, but it takes 20 minutes, and then you got to get readout. And so this guy has developed a simple thing that you just slap on your forehead, and in a couple of minutes, it tells you if you have any of these key conditions based on your EEG patterns. So yeah, so I think there's more stuff like that's coming to the forefront. I think we're a long way from control with the brain still, but there is some interesting research that shows the pathways. So for example, if you and I think of a picture of an elephant, we might think about it differently, but if you and I think of the word elephant, it activates similar brain regions. So that might be a path to a consistent sort of brain-machine interface structure of the long term. But you have to teach people maybe to think in words rather than just sort of visual images. We don't know.

But we do have this amazing neuroplasticity that gives the hope that we can rewire our brains enough to be able to do that.

Sure.

We had a neuroscientist on the show near the beginning, who has looked at brains uncovered, but prefers to work with them through brain waves. He doesn't like to poke electrodes in. So tell us about Talla and what you were doing there?

Yeah, so after I sold my first company, I knew I wanted to start something else; and I was looking at the rise of machine learning and natural language processing. And Talla initially started off looking at you just how to run operational things using natural language in the office. That turned out to be a difficult sell to enterprise companies, and so we fell into the customer support space. So the difference between Talla and a lot of other companies that do that is most

people that are building support chatbots require you to script out your support interactions, and Talla doesn't. What it does is we ingest your support documentation, and automatically create machine learning models, natural language models from that, to answer questions that people ask. So when somebody says, you know, how do I find out? You know, how do I how do I return a shipment or issue, you know, can I get a refund? We can walk them through the process for that, and we pull it out of your documents on our own, so nobody has to tell us where it is. And Talla has done a good job. I stepped away about two years ago, and we hired a CEO, but I'm still on the board there and still actively involved.

The company and product that I'm familiar with that I think is in that space is Amelia from IPSoft. Is that something that compares to what you were doing?

It is, they're related. They work very differently. The you know, the training sets are different, this sort of business model is different but yeah, similar sort of use case. Something you can drop on your website that will answer questions for people without human intervention.

Does it attempt to provide, not necessarily a face - Amelia has got a face to go with it - but does it attempt to use natural language to engage the conversant in such a way that they feel that this is a member of the team?

Not necessarily, we are pretty open with the idea that it's a chatbot, and we try to sort of disclose that. So we encourage that the companies that use our product don't have to disclose that, but we encourage them to as a best practice. Because if you've heard about this uncanny valley of robotics, where the people don't know how to feel yet about talking to machines, and I think it's going to take a while. I mean, you're going to have a generation of kids that's going to grow up with Amazon Echoes, and other voice helpers, and robots that they interact with. And I think that generation when they become adults and get into the workforce will have very different views on this stuff. And I think you'll see a rapid shift in product design at that time as it becomes more acceptable, but I think for those of us who are a little bit older, we still sometimes find it odd. I don't even like to talk to Siri, or say, "OK, Google". I prefer to just type in my map or my direction or whatever because it feels awkward even if I'm alone in the car.

I find I inhabit that space of, if I'm talking, if I need assistance, the kind of assistance that a digital assistant like the chatbot on the bank's website can provide is not going to cut it. Because all they know how to do is show me something that's on the website, and I already know how to find that. And so if I'm asking, it's because of something that's not there, and that's what frustrates me. Although I did get a call the other day from the Google digital assistant, verifying my Google business listing; and I didn't realize until I hung up, that it wasn't a person, and then I went, "Wait a minute, that's not the usual kind of interaction that I have with someone making that kind of call". They weren't pushy, and they were straight to the point, and then I replayed it [in my mind]. And I realized that they said at the beginning that it was some kind of automated interface.

Yeah, Google's done a really good job with their voice technology. And, you know, they have their Duplex product, which can make reservations for you and do very simple things when

interacting with small businesses; and now I think they've released it for the other side for interacting with customers. So it's still new, but for what it can do, it's an impressive leap.

If this one had had the same voice as the one I saw in the demonstration of booking the haircut, I would have recognized it, but it was a different voice, a man's voice.

Yeah.

So we talk about a huge range of things with artificial intelligence on this show, and a lot of them are speculative, and in the future, and getting into philosophy, and now here we are - whiplash alert - at the other end, the here and now, the things that people pay dollars and cents for, and the kind of issues that companies are facing right now, in artificial intelligence revolve a lot around ethics and bias, explainability, transparency, accountability. What sort of role do those issues play when you're looking at investing in a company?

That's a great question. There are a lot of nuances to talk about here in an answer. Let me talk about sort of two pieces to that. One is, when you're looking at early-stage start-ups, we primarily do pre-seed and seed. So if you're not familiar with those terms, you know, pre-seed is typically a company just getting off the ground. Maybe they have a product finished, maybe they don't. Maybe they have a beta customer too; and seed is more has a little bit of an established team, they have a couple of customers are generating some revenue, but they're still not very far along. Almost every company we invest in hasn't made a million dollars in revenue yet, so it's all very, very early. Sometimes one of the things you can exploit as a start-up versus a big company is your willingness to enter a space that's not regulated or where the regulations are unclear, or where a large company might not want to play, for reasons that are legally related. So if you look at something like PayPal, when PayPal went public, I think they had lawsuits filed against them in 48 states. And it wasn't that people at big banks like you know, JP Morgan, or Chase or Bank of America, Wells Fargo, like, they didn't know that you could send money online, or nobody had this idea. It was it you couldn't get it through the rooms of lawyers, who were saying like, "Well, no, it's not clear, and we can't take this risk, and we can be sued for billions of dollars or whatever". And so for Pay Pal, you don't care, right? Because your start-up bet is either it works or it doesn't, and if they can go public and make it happen, then they do very well financially, and the laws eventually adapt, and you've seen that with a lot of successful companies. Sometimes, yeah, both sides, you know, Uber's changed a lot of laws, some that have been successful. But there was a guy a few years ago who was trying to do the TV streaming thing, I forget what it was called. And he was pulling a bunch of signals and then sending over the internet, you know, bundled together, Arrow TV or something like that, and they got shut down for that reason, and it didn't go anywhere. A lot of the crypto companies have been shut down for violation of the law, but at the same time Coinbase, and some of the ones that have done well, so you don't have it. And I think you're going to see a lot of that with AI. I think you're going to see some companies that win as the laws start to come into play. Some companies win because they're willing to take the risk that the law moves against them, but it ends up not moving against them, and so that's one piece of it. So we think about that a lot, and that can actually be an advantage, right? As you look at that, you say, well, Google should do

that you should do this, but Google won't touch it for legal reasons. And then the second thing when you think about ethics and bias, and everything else is, we do think about risks there. And we think more about the sort of public outcry and moral or ethical risk, and it's complicated, right? But sometimes we ask founders their perception on it, because if you look at older types of engineering, civil engineering, mechanical engineering; most of the programs for those disciplines require an ethics course because you can't be a civil engineer and be like, "Hey, I'm going to skip and use about a third of the concrete I need on this bridge, save a little bit of money", because it's going to come crashing down and people die, right? So they really sort of drill that into your head. But then when electrical engineering and computer science sort of came about, I mean, I never took an ethics class. So I didn't have to, a lot of people, I think still don't. And so we've designed this, we've had 20 years of designing products now for the Internet age where we didn't really think about that. And you know, the people that design the Facebook interface, and the people that think about Twitter and Google AdWords and all these kinds of things, they think about how to get you to click on more ads, and they don't think about the ethical or moral implications of that. And I think it's something that people should pay more attention to, which is, we're not an ESG fund. I'm not just trying to invest in things that are good for society, but I don't necessarily want to invest in things that I think are going to be harmful and dangerous to society. And people are starting to think about that, so if you look at OpenAI in their GPT-3 language model, the companies I know that I have access to it and are working with it are required to meet regularly with OpenAI, and they're not allowed to use it for things like political content or to write political ads. Because, you know, OpenAI wants to make sure that the language models aren't misused. Now, at some point, you know, probably in five or six years, you'll be able to have GPT-3 on your phone, something that's super powerful. So I don't know what's going to happen, then. I'm a little bit worried, but yes, something that we do think about when we invest.

I think from some people who haven't been exposed to big corporations on the inside, there's a tendency to think that they're all the same. But there does seem to be a difference in ethical temperatures between say, Facebook, and Apple, and Google, and Uber. I can sense the difference in values between many of these companies. The mantra at the beginning of Silicon Valley, back at the dot.com boom was move fast and break things. So that the last thing on anyone's mind was what the ethical implications would be unless it was a show-stopping legal liability. But we've seen a cultural shift in the United States, especially in the last few years, with diversity, equity, and inclusion movement, Me Too, and Black Lives Matter to make those kinds of values a lot more visible and important. And so how much did those affect the decisions of start-ups looking to employ AI when AI is really a way of scaling up the way that we make decisions that have impacts on exactly those values?

Well, I think it's really difficult right now. Because when you look at a lot of those movements, I think one of the problems with a lot of the current social justice movements is they're sort of not based on reason, the way that earlier ones were, right? It was very much sort of grounded in reason and logic to say that slavery was wrong. And a lot of the things that people are pushing for now, are much more ambiguous, and it's hard to figure out and there are a lot of trade-offs

that don't make sense. So just to give you an example, I don't know if you followed some of this work out of the UK, but there's been a lot of work done on gender work, LGBTQ for teens. And so you have two schools of thought; one school of thought is and the question is, 'should you let a 14-year-old change their gender'? And one school of thought says, "Well, yes, because if you don't acknowledge that and accept that, they're at risk of suicide, and they're depressed, and their risk of all kinds of harm, and emotional, and physical and whatever. And there's another point of view that says, "Well, being a teenager is hard, it is confusing, and sometimes people try on identities, and maybe some of them are trying on gender identity," and so we should wait and see. What's the big deal? Wait for a few, you know, wait until they're 20 or 25, or something like that, and there are examples of both, right? There have examples of people who have changed and when they were teenagers and wanted to change back. And they're people who have committed suicide because they weren't allowed to change, and so it's a really complicated problem. And I think a lot of them are like that today, and I think we have become super sensitive to this stuff. There was an article that just came out in the New York Times today, you know, the day we're recording this about Smith College here in Massachusetts, and they had shut down their cafeteria, and nobody was allowed to eat in it, and a young black woman, female student had gone to eat in the cafeteria. So when the janitor came up and said, "Hey, you're not supposed to be in here", and kind of harassed her to get out, she said, "Oh, you know, you're racist. You're doing this, because I'm black, and I'm here and whatever". And like, he's like, "No, no, no, no, I'm doing this because nobody's supposed to be in the cafeteria, no matter who you are", and so you have to be careful. I think when we get very sensitive to these things, we start to see it everywhere, even when it's not, right? It's like, nobody's allowed to be in the cafeteria, but because the young woman was a black woman, it's a sort of racist, sexist thing, is how she interprets it, right? And so I think you have a lot of those problems when you look at these ethical decisions in machine learning, right? Because of, you know, a great example of language models is should a language model, if the statistics actually say in the United States, 80% of nurses are women, should a language model make an assumption that a nurse is a woman, right? I can think of scenarios where that's very dangerous and scenarios where it's not, right? And so what do you want to do? You really need the model to know that that job category leans female, but is not all female. And I think part of the problem with a lot of these models, and with AI in general, is that right now, we sort of deal at high level and generalizations. And the thing about stereotypes is, stereotypes can be true, but they're not 100% accurate of a group. And so if you can say something as broadly true about men or women, there are always exceptions, and you don't know who you're dealing with, for any individual, right? And so you always have to take an individual at face value, and be respectful and get to know them, and so it's hard, because all these things that I'm talking about can find their way into models, even if you don't try to program them in there, right? If you don't include race in a credit scoring model, it can still develop a bias that it may pick up by proxy, you know, zip codes that are largely minority demographic, or names that are largely, you know, ethnic or something like that. There's a whole bunch of other things, or information you could ask for that could be proxies for that, that's very, very dangerous.

It's an extremely hot button sort of topic around this issue of bias in AI, and sometimes you have self-fulfilling prophecies like the predictive policing that says, "There'll be a crime in this area," and the cops go and hang out at such and such an intersection. Sure enough, they see someone dealing on the corner, and they bring them in. But there's the observational bias, there, it becomes, could be potentially self-fulfilling prophecy, because what if they got sent to the corner of Wilshire Boulevard and Rodeo Drive, right? They might have equally seen something happening there, they just weren't hanging out there. There's the way in which the data can be true, but then there's also the way in which we want to change how that data is true to improve it in certain areas. I don't think we've really come to grasp with the difference between those two things.

Yeah, and I would expect that, I suspect that we'll see a lot of problems with this in the future. You know, there was a study done a while back about social views on music. And what they did was they took these songs that were newly released that nobody had heard of, and they recruited a few thousand people to listen to and rank these songs, and they scored them what was good, what was bad, but you couldn't see anybody else's ranking, then they showed you other people's ranking, and it became this winner take all effect, right? You think other people like this; therefore you actually like it more, right? Perception becomes reality, then they actually forced the rankings to be something pre-set, and they saw that that had a big impact on how things turned out. It's not like you couldn't take a terrible song and makes it number one, but you can make it better than the last place. And you can take a great song and make it last place, but you might not make it the top song anymore, right? And so you can influence these things, so there is this interaction between perception and reality that, as we turn more of the analysis over to AI, I wonder about that. I wonder what will happen and I wonder if the models start to compress, right? Because the spectrum of human - take language, right? So language is very broad, but now Google starts to base on language, we have finished your emails for you. So let's say after 10 years of finishing these emails, there are a couple of common patterns emerging, the diversity in that language corpus is now smaller, and so that's going to take language in a difficult direction, possibly for language models. And so you can think about just all kinds of problems that are going to be caused by this we're just not ready to deal with I think, as a society.

Right, one of the things that I've been thinking is that the creation of artificial intelligence, primarily in Silicon Valley will lead to a kind of cultural empire building, where the way that people there in the valley think, the values that they have, and the way that they solve problems logically, will become spread over the world by default, by all these digital assistants perpetuating the same model. And that other alternative ways of thinking about time, goals, tasks, and the relative importance of family versus job, for instance, seems a very different priority in large parts of the world, say, compare Latin America to your average Silicon Valley culture. And that might unconsciously, subconsciously, spread those values in the same way that Charlie Brown and Mickey Mouse spread American values through the world's cinemas.

Yeah, and you have this interesting sort of dichotomy with respect to that, which is, Silicon Valley has become all about scale and growth and all that kind of stuff; and scale requires some

homogeneity, right? To roll something out, you have to be roughly the same or be able to keep it kind of the same or take the same approach. Diversity can be very inefficient, because now you have lots of something to deal with. I mean, it's much better that there are Linux, Android, and Windows and just a couple of major platforms to deal with, rather than 60 platforms that all have their quirks and bells and whistles. And it allows for a lot of scales and positive ways, but at the same time, when you look at bad scenarios, diversity is what helps you, right? The diversity in the gene pool, the diversity of ideas, is what allows you to say, "Well, what is this crazy idea over here? Here's this one trait that hasn't been very popular". I mean, everything that's in the human genome has some survival value under some type of condition, right? That's sort of why it's there. And so it's just most of the time, we're not in these extreme conditions where that gets called out. And so I worry a little bit about those two sort of opposing points of view, right? As we increasingly make things homogenous and scale them more, and all our economic incentives drive that. And you drive diversity, diversity of idea, diversity of platform, diversity of everything, we'll drive diversity out of our genomes, probably at one point, at some point, so it's concerning, right? Because if there's a, I mean, look, here's a perfect example, right? Should everybody switch to electric cars? Well, we just had this problem in Texas where it got too cold and power plants shut down, and what do you do if you have an electric car and you can't charge it, right? So it's like things that people don't think about it like, "Hey, Uber is great, and it's so effective for traffic management, and it's so much better than 99% of the time it is"; and then what if you live in Miami, and there's a hurricane coming, nobody owns a car, you just have Ubers, and everybody's trying to get out of Miami at the same time? And so there's eight times the demand for the number of Ubers. It's like there's they're these survival situations, these extreme situations that we don't think about that, when we optimize these systems, those survival situations become dangerous.

And that's the end of part 1 of the interview. We'll conclude it next week, of course. I was really interested in how brain-machine interfaces are already on Rob's radar, if only at the edge of the range. The neuroscientist I was referring to in the interview that we had on the show was Dr. Ryan D'Arcy, who was on episodes 6 and 7, who researches how to fix broken brains with non-invasive methods. He was a fellow speaker at the TEDx Bear Creek Park event I spoke at; another neuroscientist I've worked with who was at this year's Bear Creek Park was Olav Krigolson, who does amazing things with brain wave analysis, and hopefully by the time this episode comes out, his talk will be at ted.com.

In today's story ripped from the headlines about AI, AI startup StoryFile has built a videobot of William Shatner – and if you don't know who William Shatner is, I'm sorry, you can't listen to this podcast any more. No, he's Captain Kirk from the original Star Trek series. Seriously, drop everything and go watch it if you don't know what I'm talking about. Anyway, they have created a digital version of him which we can only refer to as the Shatbot, and they interviewed him against a green screen with all kinds of 3-D cameras trained on him so their AI could learn his expressions – now right there is a challenge, anything that learns Shatner's expressions needs a lot of RAM – and he answered all kinds of questions for them so it could learn about his speaking style and content and then when you ask the Shatbot a question, it will search through its memory and construct an appropriate answer which it can then animate the Shatbot to virtually speak. We've seen technology like this before with Samsung's Neon avatars, which they showed at CES a couple of years ago. And it's also similar to Microsoft saying recently that they can train a chatbot to answer questions like anyone they have enough text samples for – which can be a real

person or a fictional one, you heard me mention that in the last interview with David Gerrold. Except that's just text and StoryFile has done the whole enchilada. Shatner, who recently turned 90, himself thinks this is cool because it could be on a gravestone and his descendants could come and ask him questions. There's a link to the video of this where you can see how good the Shatbot is in the show transcript: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vEVNdCXJ\\_es](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vEVNdCXJ_es) .

By the way, I'm thinking of doing an episode that looks at how AI has been represented or misrepresented in fiction: books, movies, TV shows. What did they get wrong, what did they get right, and how have they contributed to our understanding or our beliefs about AI? I haven't seen everything that fits that description, of course, and neither do I have any intention of trying to consume all of it; for one thing, there's a lot of dreck that I don't want to lose neurons watching. But if there's a particular book or show you'd like us to cover on that episode, drop me a line and we'll see if we can work it in. There's a contact form on my website of [humancusp.com](http://humancusp.com).

Next week we'll conclude the interview with Rob May, and we'll be talking about digital assistants and affective computing, which is AI that can understand human expressiveness in terms of emotion, and we'll talk about privacy issues with that, what AI startups aren't doing but should – and what they are doing and shouldn't. 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>