Human Intelligence (HI) and Artificial Intelligence (AI) are synergizing at an accelerating pace. Eventual fusion of the two is well advertised, but not well understood as a transitional and dialectical phenomenon. It is one thing to talk of the singularity as an engineering phenomenon, and another to really understand what this process means within the global eco-social context.

Consider the huge difference between inherited genetic intelligence, and understanding the modern world. There is a huge difference between piles of information on the Internet, and creative knowledge. A quantitative increase in information does not automatically increase quality wisdom.

There are many hard-to-quantify differences among value systems. Some value systems are socially consonant, and some dissonant. Over time, formerly consonant values can become dissonant as societies change. One example is the structural-functional role of some early religions, versus later structural-dysfunctional tendencies. Independent of time and events, everything can be somewhat described using systems theory.

There will be little in the early synthesis of HI and AI that alone harmonizes social differences. Nothing technical automatically gives us the optimum, including DNA and quantum computers. Just because IBM’s Watson beat Ken Jennings does not make Watson wise. Serious social differences underlie the profound dangers we face going deeper into the 21st century and beyond. Something more is needed: philosophical AI wisdom guiding action between the pillars of ignorance and hubris.
In 1995 I wrote a book, *Humans and Comphumans*,\(^1\) that introduced the idea of “comphumans.” These are AI entities with philosophical wisdom proportionate to their great power within cybernetic networks. Another spin on this topic is found in my 1996 premature fantasy dialogue, *Conversations With Adam*.\(^2\)

I followed these works with a book in 2005, *Honest Religion in the 21st Century*.\(^3\) That essay explored the only core of religion that is not absurd or potentially dangerous. Considering the evil pseudo-religious attacks not long thereafter (such as 9/11, and the rise of ISIS) my 2005 discussion deserves a fresh read.

Prospective publishers scoffed at all three AI essays, and another social essay I wrote in 1974, *The American Eutopia*.\(^4\) Nevertheless, time has shown the increasing relevance of my earlier themes. Library shelves today are cluttered with miles of books containing human folly passing for wisdom.

If today in 2017 I were to seriously rewrite my AI books, there would be major changes that reflect the dialectically accelerating nature of emergent technology – so full of potential for good, but held hostage by the dangerous dance among competing societies and cultures within deteriorating global ecology.

There are no comphumans in the world. Nor has there been much progress toward emergent philosophical genius. AI today is often an extension of generic HI, employing faster speed with better data mining, all in the service of profit or power. Robots over the next few decades will take many of our jobs, but only as task-oriented workers, not as philosophers. A century or two from now their suite of functions will be profoundly different.

---

\(^1\) [http://astronomy-links.net/HandC.html](http://astronomy-links.net/HandC.html)

\(^2\) [http://astronomy-links.net/Adam.html](http://astronomy-links.net/Adam.html)

\(^3\) [http://astronomy-links.net/HR21st.pdf](http://astronomy-links.net/HR21st.pdf)

Popular fears of emerging singularity are separated from a deeper vision of critically interconnected comphumans being enlightened guides. Popular media glorify loose nukes, specters of futuristic terminators, and hostile space-aliens. We humans love movies about global mayhem and destruction, as long as the bad guys lose in the end. Will they really lose before we lose?

Some dark visions have the AI “bad guys” likely winning. Their dark solution for menacing ignorance in the real world is a version of two-wrongs-make-a right. All the near future requires, it is implied, is to wait until highly evolved AI takes over after our collective suicidal mess subsides – and the wretched human survivors are subjugated or eliminated. Thereafter our noble AI descendants will eventually seed the galaxy, starting with our solar neighborhood.

Such a dog-eat-dog transition could happen – or we could slip into a smooth future where AI does indeed fuse with HI, creating a new hybrid sentience. What is now the Internet would continue to rapidly evolve, providing complex and extensive data for new understanding. Ethical philosophy under the serene guidance of comphumans embedded within cybernetic networks would shepherd a heavenly future, with or without Heaven.

Protoplasmic humans would remain a valued part of the AI/HI mix. After all, each natural human brain has roughly up to 100 billion neurons, and roughly up to 100 trillion neuron connections. We have hardly reached our intellectual and spiritual peaks.

I am not optimistic for this peaceful alternative future, but it is doable, and I am hopeful.

At this point I could go on and on with this essay, or stop here. Going on and on properly requires another comprehensive and heavily documented book that few would read. Maybe later I will write this. For now I will continue to focus on much easier topics, such as bringing astrophysics into the 21st century.