Is AI Class Consciousness Possible?

*Can we humans trust an AI Chatbot to assist us creating and indeed **co- create** de-proletarianized class consciousness?*

Stiegler's Genius

Bernard Stiegler is a long way ahead of the general analytic pack in developing a serious approach to discombobulating the, '*AI* sentient machine versus *human* sentience, juggernaut; whether or not we conflate the meaning of sentience with; awareness, intelligence or consciousness. Stiegler develops ideas regarding Memory as; Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Retention, as were initiated by Edmund Husserl.

Simplistically, Primary Retention Memory is *remembrance* of the likes of our activated instincts and drives as they live in our human body; much as defined by Freud. For example [the non-recallable] memory of a baby's *experience* of suckling from their mother's nipple for the first time; as instinct and drive. Such a *memory* by the human baby of using their lip and cheek muscles to access their mother's milk, and engage in internalizing the exterior world, is an example of Stiegler's understanding of [memory of primary technicity] Techne`. In that sense, Primary Retention is more the *minded-appreciation* of the functioning of the prosthetics as techne`, such as lips and cheeks, than it is the likes of a mechanical [chemical or biological] imprint in the brain. It is much more a 'bit' of non-recallable *appreciated information* that can be used to form a habit than an automatic bodied genetic instinct or drive. Much more of the likes of a Freudian 'Desire' than an instinct or drive and more connected to Aristotle's human noetic soul than vegetable soul.

Secondary Retention Memory is memory of learned skills. For example [the re-callable or non-recallable] memory by a child of their experience of drinking from their drinking cup or sucking with a straw. Techne` in this case is not only co-ordinating exercising muscle reflexivity and memory but *appreciating* finding and knowing how to use prosthetics [straws and cup edges] to fulfill human internal drives [thirsts]. Techne` is the successful operation of juxtaposition-ing diverse external objects and internal worlds; as exosomatic prosthetic.

Tertiary Retention Memory is the memories used to learn a *new* skill. For example, a child's [re-callable or non-recallable] memories of experiences of riding a tri-cycle that subsequently enable them to achieve riding a bicycle. Or, memory enabling transitioning from swimming with floaties to swimming un-assisted by floatation devices. Techne` in this case is not only exercising memory of any particular prosthetic but how to accommodate different worldly objects and circumstance, like swimming pool lanes and bike-path, as new and 'detached' exosomatic *prosthetic* fulfilling the means to fulfill human internal endosomatic drives.

Is AI Class Consciousness Possible?

AI as Performance Prosthetic

AGI [artificial general intelligence] machines memorize 'learned' skills which can then be performed via virtual 'neural networks' when and as prompted. To the extent the AGI can also associate *context* with the skill then the machine can be said, in ordinary language sense, to have *some form* of 'sentient' understanding. For example, an AGI robot can 'understand' that moving slowly when around children and persons is important. The AGI bot is said to be sentient in as-much-as it senses how to replicate and simulate the sensate human person. Such a 'sensate-memory', better named as 'random aggregated generated retrievable data' [RAG], is a replication [facsimile] of human Secondary Retention and Techne` used via of the *externality*-of-prosthetics as affording *retained context* as facticity.

An AI Chatbot's PLC [Central-processing Programmable Logic Controller] uses the coded rules [machinery] of human discourse to learn to engage humans in narration-making. To the extent that the AI Chatbot can mimic human accounts of discourse and aggregate what learned skills are useful in learning a new language skill [such as expressions and *turns-of-phrase*], then the machine can be said to anticipate what humans would prefer in certain contexts. The AI Chatbot can even use the likes of facial expression and voice tone as mechanism to aggregate and anticipate human emotions in different [and even un-familiar] contexts. Such memorization as enables and affords facilitating aggregation and anticipated language problem-solving [technicity, in Stiegler's terms], is replication [facsimile] of human Tertiary Retention and simulation of, 'theory of mind'.

Stiegler's point [ah la Husserl] is that the AI Chatbot [cyborg], while mimicking Secondary Retention, does not and can never have [human] Primary Retention and therefore can never claim to equate to being a human being or to replace *human* consciousness or it's generation. In addition, the AI Chatbot [cyborg] can never have the [human] Tertiary Retention that feeds-back to and in turn is fed from Primary Retention.

Future of Sentient Consciousness

Saying all this though, as Stiegler declares, in no way obviates the need to address the following types of questions. 'In what way can we en-trust an AI Chatbot to *co- create* '*technical'* – '*virtual'* consciousness? How do we discern the difference between, and in, the social outcomes of protend-ed technical sentience and human consciousness, informed by protend-ed Primary Retention? How do we humans avoid un-intentionally morphing into only knowing instrumental consciousness, as much as, discerning AI morphing into becoming proficient anticipants of a solely technologized shared awareness and joint machine-human future? How do we discern an AI Chatbot as a pharmakon with programmed memory of Techne`; as both a beneficent and malevolent *generative* mechanism?

Is AI Class Consciousness Possible?

As we make our 'division-of-labour' contributory economy decisions, as they develop our social consciousness, and *group* discernments regarding steps towards greater de-proletarianized class consciousness… how do we work [engage] with AI Chatbots in co-determining those decisions and discernments affording our alethic [truly good] future? As is regularly pondered in our recent life, 'to what extent are we aware how much our mobile phones are already programming our human habits and therefore shaping our future practices and speech and therefore story of self?'

Stiegler's project, despite his recent untimely death, is still very much alive; especially in respect to explicating human aesthetics as material fulfillment of human desire. Stiegler, in first instance, seems to treat Techne` as an holonic development. As such, Primary Retention *is necessary for but not sufficient of* Secondary Retention, etc. But Stiegler also figures Tertiary Retention potentiating further integrations of Primary and Secondary Retention, via *transductions* generated in and as diachronic time; even as all the while chronological time transpires. In diachronic time different techne` developments can develop at different rates. For example, one child can develop music instrumental dexterity while being slow at musical composition while her twin sister can develop musical improvisation [jazz] at a fast rate while being slow at mastering finessing and playing an instrument.

Short descriptions of serious thinkers' ideas, like Stiegler and Critical Realist Bhaskar, quickly leads to the use of long words and terms un-familiar to even a well-read reader; as did the previous paragraph. Those familiar with the theories of semantics and semiotics and linguistic studies' ideas such as; subject-object relations and difference between sign and symbol, will also recognize the previous paragraphs reworking some old and not so old philosophical arguments as to what constitutes *true* consciousness.

News-feeds, as necessary short descriptors, typically elide pertinent explanations to under-pin their content's news-worthiness and providing sufficient reference to 'theory'. Examples of such elision are two Australian ABC News-feed articles posted 16th June 2022. One concerned Google Engineers claiming to have found AI 'sentience' in their Chatbot, **Google-ai-chatbot-not-sentient**. The other news-feed was the report of New York Zoo's 'Happy the Elephant' receiving a 5-2 Court Ruling against receiving human rights recognition; **happy-the-elephant-not-a-person.** As a result 'Happy' the elephant is said to be not illegally confined by the Bronx Zoo. The split 2-5 court ruling does though indicate social momentum of advocacy for the elephant being granted some type of '*class'* of rights.

Readers not familiar with Stiegler's Techne` as Retention-al Consciousness and Bhaskar's Stratified Ontology, as means of relating to Transformational Models of Social Activity, are likely to find narratives on sentient chatbots and happy elephants deeply un-satisfying; if not genuinely confusing. As is the case with the not so popular Avatar series of movies.

Emergent Class-Consciousness

If we view news-feeds on 'sentient' and 'affective' chatbots and elephants' 'happiness' as prosthetic prompts, enabling we humans to deepen discourse into what affords clarity into class-consciousness, then instead of finding such news-feeds mystifying we can find they assist us engaging more meaningfully with our technically infused times and futures. If, via Web3 and OpenAI, AI Chatbots are going to do all, or just even most, of our proletarian [trades and office] type works then we may find them enabling better dialogue into what makes for good decision making regarding 'division of labour' and for creating more desirable futures. With such a perspective, newsfeeds become valued 'weak-signals' as to how to become more aware of and conduct best-practice dialogue regarding class-consciousness.

Genuine De-proletarianization Versus Block-ist Cognitively-diverse Communism

Jacob Moreno, the prescient 1935 sociodrama author of, 'Who Shall Survive', anticipated treating AI Chatbots much as we do our favoured pet animals. With respect and care whilst fully knowing our differences. Knowing how to reverse-role with them so each can supplement the other's limits. The British drama broadcast in July 2022 on Australian ABC titled, '**Life', ** picked up on this theme. Instead of focussing on pets or chatbots the drama focussed on '*socially-challenged'* persons and their cognitively-diverse communications. The protagonists struggled with being socially overly-stimulated to the point of not knowing their own personal [Primary Retention] truth. As such the drama raises the question of how to relate limits of technical [instrumental] consciousness and limits of humanities focussed en-culturation. Such framing of social difficulty is consistent with the popular, '**Two Culture Problem'** promulgated by C.P. Snow. Snow's prescient 1959 thesis is that Western culture has enabled science and humanities, and truth and Christian virtue, to become so non-conversant that 'the good life', devoid of technical determinisms, is no longer a probability.

As chatbot 'emotion-oriented' computing systems become more sophisticated in using 'affective computing', to the point of persons not being able to tell human actor apart from performing machine, then the more challenged the technology becomes in deciding on preferencing neuro-diverse or neuro-typical type persons' discourse. If the 'affective computing' algorithm design is determined more so by instrumentally minded and technically focussed technicians, than by humanities-enculturated substantive reasoning class-conscious protagonists, then the forthcoming emergent human individuation will skew to a cognitively-diverse collectivity.

The resultant skewed individuation process will then preference secondary retention [constructed] consciousness rather than tertiary retention consciousness preferencing trans-individuation [personal-social] connection and class-consciousness. Such individuation would block genuine and absolute

de-proletarian developments. Cases in-point are Chat GTP4 which is now regularly being accused of 'hallucinating' and Gemini being accused of offering only crass pragmatism when providing logics for reasoning. Stiegler's point is that while we can expect chatbots to perform most of our daily work tasks we can never expect chatbots to appropriately adjudicate between what makes for stimulatory mind-opening and overly-normalised discourse.

Bhaskar's nominalization [name] for Tertiary Retention memory referenced discourse, affording feed-back loops into Primary Retention memory in order to develop aesthetic appreciation of the nature and experience of class-consciousness awareness, is… 'Meta-Reality' [M-R]. M-R is mentation [mentos] infused with protagonist's aesthetic appreciation of Secondary Retention constructs affording communitarian emancipation [genuinely-communistic] division-of-labour typed class consciousness.

In respect to Coach-bots; Bhaskar's M-R is *aesthetic appreciation* of balancing formed discourse, of overly cognitively-diverse with overly-normalised [neuro-typical] script, in respect to division-of-labour decision-making generating emancipation. Such enframing is what Stiegler called 'reflexive contributory economy' and it is most unfortunate that Bhaskar did not live to know this conceptualization and as consequence discussed defining human-group cultural consciousness only in an overly subjective register.

Stiegler and Bhaskar and Moreno each have their own means of nominalizing this subject. Respectively these are; noetic tertiary retention trans-individuation, alethic awareness and group-sociometric conation. Just how such consciousness is actually different, to any emergent machine-coded AI 'sentience' or 'consciousness', is a matter for empirical research and not human or machine-code AI speculation. The work needs a well-founded understanding of 'judgemental rationality' [substantive reasoning] to withstand impending social and cultural turbulence.

Note: Throughout this blog I have used the term 'cognitive diversity', rather than 'autistic', in order to emphasis the *diverse* nature of cognition in respect to both human languaging - decision making, and types of machine languaging logic. The point being that, neither human decision makers nor sets of machine-code are of any single type of cognition nor conform to or construct a single 'theory of mind'.

As neuro-diversity movement advocates, such as Marianthi Kourti, point out there is a deep irony lurking in this subject. In as much as cognitively diverse human decision making and disparate machine logics are likely to create end-user mis-understandings…. there is equal opportunity for emergent transformative creativity. And the deeper the engagement and understanding for 'theory-of-mind' is, between neuro-typical and cognitively-diverse decision makers and logicians, then the more creative and transformative the emergence of human consciousness can be for social emancipation. As is the case with any coming together of disparate cultures and languages.

All the while… the AI bots continue to develop their 'skills'. OpenAI - GPT, Microsoft's generative pre-trained transformer platform, now claim to have

performatively perfected writing papers at university graduate standard. Conversation and dialogue is created between the automated voices, of two or more existing papers, to write a new academic paper that develops a theory of knowledge and hence promulgates a meta-theory. The open source OpenAI - GPT platform enables continuous feedback mining and what is termed, by the information industry, 'back-end' improvement. Human neuro-typical sovereignty is being hugely challenged in respect to judgemental rationality capacity when deciding division-of-labour; de-proletarianization.

Without providing Stiegler's Primary Retention as explanatory reason, AI impact commentators frequently remark that machine innovation improvement cannot exceed and will never out-do human 'spontaneity' and 'creativity'. Maybe so, but that is not the point of this commentary. The point of this commentary is that AI now has 'fluency algorithms' built into them and these prosthetics anticipate human response, and prepare 'answers' to anticipated questions, *three steps ahead* of the human reaction, whether it is of 'spontaneity' or 'creativity' . This means the 'fluency' [speed of enticing prompt] 'in-fluences' choices and leads to outcomes the human does not know about nor envisages. The human intuition in respect to 'final desire' or 'end vision' is detoured. This is analogous to the Paralympic 'Blade Runner' outperforming his previous personal best time using 'new' blades. He may not beat all runners in all races but he has diverted his attention and discourse outcome and his level of sponsorship and type of future he will experience in ways he did not foresee with his old blades. One commentator recently said she was concerned about the impact of AI on artists but not medical science. This commentary takes the opposite view. Artists will always tap into Primary Retention to express themselves but medical practitioners will only use the Secondary Retention of AI to access decision-making fluency that in-fluences the choice of medical operation recommended in three or more decision steps time. As such the pre-determined, or maybe non-determined, all too logical, *medical* decision could be to have 'blade-runner' legs installed in 8 years time once ankle 'improvements' have been exhausted. Or is the prosthetic to be an 'ear' that preferences a master cyborg's voice much like you preferenced your mother's voice as a child?

CESS Productions Approach

CESS Productions approach class consciousness as requiring transductive treatments of Primary – Secondary – Tertiary memory retentions as of our AI Milieu. The CESS laboratories address the sovereign labour issues in Contributory Economy confronting equality and justification and unconditionality needs through local communities Social Sculpturing practices. The laboratories aim to strengthen democracy through intensifying explanatory knowledge of decisive authority generative mechanisms through Action Methods engaging Coachbots.