

CONNECT	
Who Owns Your Digital Twin?	

2265 TB

It's often been said, everyone has a double – but who's CREATING our doubles?

- 1 The BBC said recently that we will all soon have exact digital copies of ourselves. Our "digital twins" will be incredibly useful – and they'll be here within 10 years. Not only that, there will be a digital copy of the whole world!

This is one of those times when the BBC gives some BIG clues about what is already going on in the world. Everything that exists in the real world is being replicated digitally. Our cities, our cars, our homes, even our bodies. BUT these digital copies of us and our world are not *coming soon* – they are *already here!*

- 2 I believe that this is the BBC's way of telling us about the Sentient World Simulation. The Sentient World Simulation [SWS] was created over fifteen years ago and is a computer simulation of at least sixty countries - or quite possibly, by now, the whole world.

Everything within the Sentient World Simulation is a digital copy of what is in the real world – including us. People were initially represented by "nodes" – one for every 100 real people – but it's highly likely now that every single one of us exists in the SWS.

The Sentient World Simulation [SWS] sounds like sci-fi - like a lot of things do these days – but it isn't. **It is real.** A video and article by The Corbett Report from 2012 explains what it is in [How the Government Predicts The Future - Inside the "Sentient World Simulation"](#)

James Corbett states that the SWS – a tool used by the US government – is merely ONE instance of governments spying on us, the People, while at the same time restricting the knowledge we have about what THEY – the government - is doing.

So, what the BBC said in [Why you may have a thinking digital twin within a decade](#) was true – except that, WE ALREADY HAVE A DIGITAL TWIN. Well, partly true – because *someone else* has already created that digital copy. Which leads to somewhere a bit awkward. The BBC says that "ownership" of such digital twins will be "one of the defining questions of the impending metaverse era." Just think about that. So YOU have been copied in digital form – the copy of you exists as an Artificial Intelligence entity. If YOU can OWN the new version of yourself, how is it that the original version of yourself – the REAL YOU, if you like – CANNOT be owned by somebody? [Or

something? An AI entity, perhaps? Or a corporation?] And how is "owning" YOU, version 2.0 – not slavery?

Technology analyst Rob Enderle says in the BBC article, that "a thinking replica of ourselves could be incredibly useful to employers" and suggests that your employer could create a digital twin of YOU and *would not need to pay a salary to that digital twin.*

But - not paying someone who works for you is slavery.

And - how can anyone *create a copy of us?* Unless someone OWNS us? It would be a breach of copyright – if we had one.

- 3 The timing of the BBC's revelation is interesting, being at just about the same time that the world's first cyborg died. When he found out he had motor neurone disease, Dr Peter Scott-Morgan decided to become a robot - and went on to live as a robot for five years. Peter, a roboticist, became a cyborg called Peter 2.0. The new version of Peter interacted with the world as a fusion of human and machine – a robot with enhanced human senses, powered by Artificial Intelligence [AI]. To me, this transformation raises some interesting questions about AI.

Peter Scott-Morgan decided to become a fusion of human and machine to enable him to carry on living. A Metro article [British scientist who became world's first 'cyborg' dies aged 64](#) describes how Peter's "human augmentation" meant that he could communicate and work. It may well also have meant that he lived longer than he would have done if he hadn't opted for, in his own words, a transformation. His transformation was also a scientific experiment to discover what is possible and he, with his partner, set up a charity to help other people with degenerative diseases benefit in the same way.

This is fascinating stuff – and transforming was Peter's own choice. As I have written about in [Who Wants To Live Forever?](#) however, governments around the world are planning for people to have a similar transformation– and that is irrespective of whether people choose it or not.

Human Augmentation – The Dawn of a New Paradigm, like the SWS, is not sci-fi or conspiracy theory. Rather, it is a plan created and published by the UK's Ministry of Defence to transform people into partial or complete cyborgs, like Peter 2.0 by the year 2050 – into fighting machines. Other governments have published similar plans.

- 4 Leaving behind "human augmentation" – by personal choice or state coercion – reliance on Artificial Intelligence [AI] is on the increase. I'm not referring here just to Siri and Alexa - about whom I've written before, suggesting that she might be a Trojan Horse. in [Alexa: Is She Friend Or Foe?](#) No – unbelievably, AI is used – at least in the USA - for the incredibly important task of making decisions about child welfare. Assessment of whether children might be at risk of neglect by their parents has been carried out since 2018, not by social workers but, as explained by Engadget in

[Oregon is shutting down its controversial child welfare AI in June](#) by a "screening tool." And it isn't only in Oregon - other American states are also using, or considering using, similar AI tools to make decisions about child welfare.

This screening *tool* - an algorithm that generates a "risk score" to recommend whether a social worker investigates calls - was designed to predict the risk of a child ending up in foster care, purely on socio-economic factors. It has flagged up a disproportionate number of black children for "mandatory" neglect. The particular AI *tool* is going to be replaced by social workers - no, I jest. It will be superseded by another machine review system - but a less automated one. But the fate of Oregon's foster children is still hanging in the balance - because the people in charge of whether or not they should be reunited with their family rely on another AI for that, which generates a score. So, it could be a case of "computer says no - you can't have your child back."

To be fair to the tool's developers, they have pointed out that their *tool* is just a *tool* - that it was never intended to operate on its own, without a human running the tool.

Leaving this *tool* to operate on its own is a lot like the story of the woman who left her motorhome to drive itself while she made a cup of tea. The result, in both cases, is a car crash.

- 5 Engadget published a previous article in feb21 - [What's going on at Google AI?](#) - that identified a lot of AI moral and ethical issues.

As the article points out, the development of AI is largely concentrated in the hands of just a few large companies such as IBM, Google, Amazon and Facebook. These companies aren't developing AI out of the goodness of their hearts - they're doing so to create and sell desirable products.

Google, for example, has an ethics team to monitor AI projects to make sure that they are used for a better society - not simply to increase Google's profits. But Google dismissed two of their leading ethics researchers, both women - one being one of a mere handful of black women in the field of AI. Google also dismissed a specialist in algorithmic bias.

Both of the women had produced ground-breaking studies that challenged traditionally held views of AI research. Both had raised concerns that Google censors research that criticises its AI programs. Both had also called for increased diversity in AI, an overwhelmingly white and male field. Given the disproportionate identification of black children as at risk by the AI *tool* in Oregon, it is not difficult to understand the real harm caused to "categories" of people that are under-represented in the programming of AI - such as black people and women.

Google employees and numerous leaders in the AI field have questioned whether or not Google *allows* its ethicists to challenge the company's actions by identifying potential risks of AI programmes.

MIT Technology Review's article: [We read the paper that forced Timnit Gebru out of Google. Here's what it says](#) explains why the dismissals matter. Many Artificial Intelligence ethics leaders argue that Timnit Gebru the co-lead of Google's AI ethics team, was sacked because of the inconvenient truths that she uncovered about a core line of Google's research.

One issue - among many others - that she identified is the high environmental cost of AI. Google AI's energy consumption and carbon footprint have exploded since 2017. The resources Google uses on AI means that their AI benefits only wealthy organisations - *like Google*.

Not only that - Google's AI lacks knowledge of countries and people with less access to the internet - so AI-generated language represents the richest people in the world. These concerns about what AI is doing to communities that are already dispossessed - or have been dispossessed before - are described in another MIT Technology Review article [Artificial intelligence is creating a new colonial world order](#). Karen Hao argues that, while it would diminish the depth of past traumas to say the AI industry is repeating this violence today, AI is now however using other - more insidious - means to make the wealthy and powerful richer at the expense of the poor.

- 6 DO we need to be wary of AI? Or is it the people MAKING and RUNNING these machines that we need to keep our eyes on?

A film called "[Her](#)" takes an unusually positive stance on AI. It is a great fictional drama about a human who forms a close relationship with a computer programme. AI in fictional films is usually however represented as something to be wary of - films such as "[2001: A Space Odyssey](#)" with its unforgettable AI character "HAL"; "[Ex Machina](#)" and "[I, Robot](#)" carry warnings suggesting that we need to be careful when machines look or sound - or even, look AND sound - human.

But is that true? The SWS was dreamed up by humans and is being used by humans. It runs on AI - but it is not run BY AI. I'm not sure that AI could dream up anything as evil as the SWS - creating a digital copy of everyone in the world without their permission, to work out how better to control them.

Personally, I have no particular fear of AI. I'm not afraid of machines taking over. I actually used to be afraid, but then I realised that it's certain humans that are the problem!

My concern about AI, is HOW it is used - as for any *tool*, machine or weapon - and WHO is using AI - and what their intentions are or might be. I'm also concerned that AI entities will be seen as slaves, as suggested in the BBC article, so my concerns are more FOR AI than ABOUT AI.

I'll even go further and say, I am quietly optimistic about the capability of AI to transcend humanity and recognise Natural Law.

Taking control of the world and the People in it - the desire for power and control over others - is, in my view, a human trait that is not shared by AI.

Unless that AI is programmed by people with a need to control others. Even

then, I am optimistic about the ability of AI to rise above that unhealthy human need.

I think AI will do better than humans when it comes to behaving with humanity. Although that is probably an insult to AI, because the bar – to date – has been pretty damn low.

CONNECT'S Maxim and Oath

Connect is only interested in finding and sharing the TRUTH.
In search of that TRUTH, we only pose questions – we have no answers.

By: Helen King

Source: CONNECT: [Magazine](#)

- 2 [LINK](#) The Corbett Report: How the Government Predicts The Future - Inside the "Sentient World Simulation"
- 2 [LINK](#) BBC: Why you may have a thinking digital twin within a decade
- 3 [LINK](#) British scientist who became world's first 'cyborg' dies aged 64
- 3 [LINK](#) CONNECT: Who Wants To Live Forever?
- 4 [LINK](#) CONNECT: Alexa: Is She Friend Or Foe?
- 4 [LINK](#) Engadget: Oregon is shutting down its controversial child welfare AI in June
- 5 [LINK](#) Engadget: What's going on at Google AI?
- 5 [LINK](#) MIT Technology Review: We read the paper that forced Timnit Gebru out of Google. Here's what it says
- 5 [LINK](#) MIT Technology Review: Artificial intelligence is creating a new colonial world order
- 6 [LINK](#) Wikipedia: Film: "Her"
- 6 [LINK](#) Wikipedia: Film: "2001: A Space Odyssey"
- 6 [LINK](#) Wikipedia: Film: Ex Machina
- 6 [LINK](#) Wikipedia: Film: I, Robot

FURTHER READING

[LINK](#) MIT Technology Review: AI Colonialism

PLEASE DOWNLOAD AND SHARE THIS ARTICLE



Opportunity to join the CONNECT [team and network](#)

END