

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

Mick Ashby
ethics@ashby.de

Abstract

This paper combines the Good Regulator Theorem with the Law of Requisite Variety and seven other requisites that are necessary and sufficient for a cybernetic regulator to be effective and ethical. The resulting Ethical Regulator Theorem provides a basis for systematically evaluating the adequacy of existing or proposed designs for systems that make decisions that can have ethical consequences; regardless of whether the regulators are humans, machines, cyberanthropic hybrids, organizations, corporations, or government institutions. The theorem has potentially far-reaching implications for society. A six-level framework is proposed for classifying cybernetic systems, which highlights the existence of a possibility-space bifurcation in our future time-line, and the implementation of “super-ethical” systems is identified as an urgent moral imperative for the human race to avoid a technological dystopia. Concrete actions and a grand challenge are proposed to help lead the future of the human race and our wonderful planet towards a realistically achievable cyberanthropic super-ethical society.

Keywords: Ethics, Transparency, Robotics, Singularity, Cyberanthropic Utopia

The Ethical Regulator Theorem

The Good Regulator Theorem (Conant, 1970) is ambiguous because a regulator that is good at regulating is not necessarily good in an ethical sense. To avoid this ambiguity, this paper uses the term “effective” for the first meaning, “ethical” for the second meaning, and only uses “good” when both meanings are intended.

The Good Regulator Theorem proved that every effective regulator of a system must be a model of that system, and the Law of Requisite Variety (Ashby, 1956) dictates the range of responses that an effective regulator must be capable of. However, having an internal model and a sufficient range of responses is insufficient to ensure effective regulation, let alone ethical regulation. And whereas being effective does not require being optimal, being ethical is absolute with respect to a particular ethical schema.

The Ethical Regulator Theorem claims that nine requisites are necessary and sufficient for a cybernetic regulator to be effective and ethical:

1. Truth about the past and present.
2. Variety of possible actions.
3. Predictability of the future effects of actions.
4. Purpose expressed as unambiguously prioritized goals.

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

5. Ethics expressed as unambiguously prioritized rules.
6. Intelligence to choose the best actions.
7. Influence on the system being regulated.
8. Integrity of all subsystems.
9. Transparency of ethical behaviour.

Of these nine requisites, only six are necessary for a regulator to be effective. If a system does not need to be ethical, the three requisites ethics, integrity, and transparency are optional. Figure 1 and the following sections explain the requisites in more detail.




Figure 1: The Ethical Regulator System

Requisite Truth

Truth is not just about information that the regulator treats as facts or receives as inputs, but also the reliability of any interpretations of such information. This is the regulator's awareness of the current situation, knowledge, and beliefs. If the regulator's information sources or interpretations are unreliable, and cannot be error-corrected, then the integrity of the system is in danger. In extremis, if the perceptions of the regulator can be manipulated, it can be tricked into making decisions that are ineffective or unethical.

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

Some might claim that objective truth is unattainable, therefore requisite truth is unattainable, therefore no ethical regulator can exist. However, this argument is a fallacy. An ethical regulator doesn't require perfectly accurate information, rather it must be able to cope ethically with uncertainties and minimize the impact of unreliable information, misinterpretations, and deliberate misinformation as best as it can. This is much like the requirement that a good judge (effective and ethical) must be able to reach reliable verdicts "beyond reasonable doubt" from unreliable evidence.

Requisite Variety

Variety in the range of possible actions must be as rich as the range of potential disturbances or situations. This is nothing other than the Law of Requisite Variety.

Requisite Predictability

Predictability requires a sufficiently accurate model of the system being regulated, including the regulator, that can be used to rank the actions that will give the best outcome. This is nothing other than the Good Regulator Theorem.

Requisite Purpose

Purpose must be expressed as unambiguously prioritized goals, because complex systems are generally required to satisfy multiple goals. Without goals, the system cannot be effective. These goals cannot violate any ethical imperatives.

Requisite Ethics

Ethics must be expressed as unambiguously prioritized rules, regulations, and laws that codify ethical values in a human-readable form, for example, Isaac Asimov's First Law of Robotics: "A robot may not injure a human being or, through inaction, allow a human being to come to harm." (Asimov, 1942).

Ethical goals have a higher priority than goals for purpose. By always obeying the relevant highest priority ethical imperatives, the regulator is guaranteed to act ethically within the scope of the ethical schema.

Because ethical schemas vary between different cultures, in machines, they must be handled as plug-ins. And because an ethical schema can encode any ethics, good or bad, each ethical schema must be anchored in the laws of a particular legislative jurisdiction.

For example, a self-driving vehicle must avoid harming people and animals. In the U.S. and Europe, protecting a person is a higher ethical priority than protecting a cow. But, in India, where cows are sacred, the opposite priority might be ethically preferable and crossing a state or national border might require activating a different ethical schema.

A taxonomy of ethics modules can provide ethical coverage for all conceivable ethical situations. For example, medical, child-care, traffic-rules, gun-law, tax-law, contract-law, maritime-law, drone-flying, police-regulations, operating-nuclear-power-stations, and warfare-rules-of-engagement.

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

Ethics modules can be treated like device drivers, so that to be fully operational, a hypothetical gun-carrying, tax-advising robot that can drive on roads requires valid ethics modules for gun-law, tax-code, and traffic-rules. Without all necessary modules for the appropriate legal jurisdiction, the robot's gun, tax-advising, or driving capabilities are automatically disabled.

By legislating that all autonomous artificial intelligence (AI) systems must include and obey appropriate ethics modules that are issued by an organization that is run by humans, we can establish a control mechanism that should ensure that intelligent machines are always subject to human ethics; without unduly restricting the freedom of AI researchers. In fact, it will free AI researchers and knowledge engineers to focus on the more challenging requisites of truth, predictability, and intelligence.

Requisite Intelligence

Intelligence must be applied to the previous five requisite types of information to select the most rational and effective ethical action from the set of possible actions.

Requisite Influence

Influence is the existence of pathways to transmit the effects of the selected actions to the regulated system. This is not a property of the regulator itself, but a function of the connectivity relationships that span from the regulator's outputs to elements of the regulated system and its environment.

A regulator that is isolated from influencing the regulated system is not a true regulator, it is an observer or simulation, and there are no direct ethical consequences; which can be important when observing or simulating dangerous situations.

Depending on the nature of the system being regulated, the speed of the effect of actions can vary greatly. For example, a self-driving vehicle applying the brakes; the Supreme Court issuing a ruling; or someone sending a message to a complex network of amplifying and variable-delay transmission repeaters, known as Twitter followers.

In some systems, influence is more of a determining factor than variety. Indeed, the power of the Law of Requisite Variety has often been overstated, for example, claiming that the subsystem with the most variety will control a system. This is not always true.

If we consider where two systems, A and B, are competing to win control of system C, for example, two politicians seeking election, often the variety of statements, actions, and strategies of the candidates is less important than their ability to purchase advertising to influence the voters.

And if a robber uses a gun to increase his effectiveness, the use of a gun does not amplify his variety, it is just one existing element in his range of possible variety, yet making that choice greatly increases his effectiveness at controlling his victims. Such an increase in effectiveness, like buying advertising, is best explained in terms of an increase in influence. The variety of the robber or an advertising message is effectively constant.

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

Effectiveness Function

The Ethical Regulator Theorem implies that we can define a function for the effectiveness that a regulator, R, has in controlling a system to achieve a given goal. It shows that the effectiveness actually depends on the quality or strength of five requisites:

$$\text{Effectiveness}_R = \text{Truth}_R \times \text{Variety}_R \times \text{Predictability}_R \times \text{Intelligence}_R \times \text{Influence}_R$$

So if Effectiveness_A is greater than Effectiveness_B , then A is more likely than B to win control over system C. And if the quality or strength of Truth_A , Variety_A , Predictability_A , Intelligence_A , or Influence_A gets close to zero, the effectiveness of A is massively reduced.

When we introduce ethics, the effectiveness function must be modified because the effect of behaving ethically is that it reduces the variety of options that are available by removing all possibilities that are unethical. Thus, if A is an ethical politician and B is an unethical politician, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Effectiveness}_A &= \text{Truth}_A \times (\text{Variety}_A - \text{Ethics}_A) \times \text{Predictability}_A \times \text{Intelligence}_A \times \text{Influence}_A \\ \text{Effectiveness}_B &= \text{Truth}_B \times \text{Variety}_B \times \text{Predictability}_B \times \text{Intelligence}_B \times \text{Influence}_B \end{aligned}$$

Which captures the reality that, with all other things being equal, businessmen and politicians who lie and cheat have an advantage over ones that are ethical.

It is worth noting that in social systems, money can buy media influence; which in turn, if the media is broadcasting advertising, lies, or propaganda, reduces the quality of Truth_x that is received by every consumer or voter, X, which can manipulate them into making decisions that are not in their best interest.

Although the effectiveness function is stated pseudo-mathematically, it is neither necessary nor possible to calculate meaningful numerical values in order to compare the effectiveness of different systems or configurations. The essential value of the function is to understand the relationships and dependencies that it captures.

It is sufficient if an intuitive understanding of the effectiveness function informs the system design strategy; recognizing that a maximally effective system requires that the strength of five requisite dimensions are maximized, that ethics, integrity and transparency are necessary for a system to be ethically adequate, and that a successful attack on the integrity of any of the nine requisites spells disaster for the effectiveness and/or ethical adequacy of the whole system.

Requisite Integrity

Integrity of the regulator and its subsystems must be assured through features such as resistance to tampering, intrusion detection, and cryptographically authenticated ethics modules. Monitoring mechanisms must detect if any invalid ethics modules are being used or if an ethical imperative is violated, and if necessary, activate an ethical fail-safe mode, preserve evidence, and notify the manufacturer and/or the appropriate authorities.

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

The regulator's first-order integrity mechanisms offer no protection to the pathways on which the regulator depends to influence the system. This poses a potential vulnerability that can only be mitigated by using the situation awareness closed-loop feedback to check for evidence of the effect of each action. For example, you can be confident that your tweet was received and distributed by Twitter when you see that it has been retweeted.

Requisite Transparency

Transparency is defined by introducing **The Law of Ethical Transparency**, which states "For a system to be truly ethical, it must be possible to prove retrospectively that it acted ethically with respect to the appropriate ethical schema."

Whereas it doesn't really matter whether the programmers of a chess playing robot can find out why a piece was sacrificed, the logic of ethical decisions must not be hidden in the depths of opaque processes or lost to the passage of time. Generally, this requisite can only be satisfied by keeping audit trails that are adequate and secure.

When an ethically adequate system violates an ethical imperative, as they sometimes will, analysis of the audit trail will identify the reason. For example, because a faulty neural network wrongly identified a boy leading a cow as a calf leading a man, or it will prove whether a CEO was lied to about illegal corporate activities.

Integrity and **Transparency** are codependent because we require both integrity of transparency and transparency of integrity.

Evaluating Ethical Adequacy

The evaluation of ethical adequacy has strong similarities to network penetration testing, where the evaluator tries to identify weaknesses and theoretical possibilities to subvert the integrity of the system.

An evaluated system is judged on the adequacy of each requisite dimension. Only systems that meet all nine requisites are said to be "ethically adequate". Systems that do not fulfil all nine requisites are classified as "ethically inadequate" and the weaknesses listed with recommendations for improving them.

This theorem cannot be used to certify that an ethical schema is ethical because schemas can vary arbitrarily between different cultures. However, existing automatic proof algorithms will be able to detect certain types of errors before an ethical schema is packaged as a module.

Perhaps, in the near future, accredited ethical consultants will specialize in auditing and certifying the ethical adequacy of existing and proposed systems and processes.

The Law of Inevitable Ethical Inadequacy

We can derive this new law from the Ethical Regulator Theorem: "If you don't specify that you require a secure ethical system, what you get is an insecure unethical system."

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

The reason is because when ethical adequacy is not specified as a requirement for a system design, the resulting design will tend to optimize for effectiveness and therefore maximally ignore the ethical, integrity, and transparency dimensions, which are optional for a system that only needs to be effective, thus guaranteeing that any implementation will be ethically inadequate and vulnerable to manipulation; by design.

Legislative Implications

By creating a well-defined interface for coding ethics, it becomes easier to apportion legal liability for failures. For example, if a self-driving car crosses the border into India, fails to switch to the Indian government certified ethics module for traffic-rules, and decides to hit a cow to avoid hitting a person, then the car manufacturer can be held liable for the crime of killing a sacred animal. But if the correct ethics module was activated, but the “don’t hit cows” rule had an incorrectly low priority in the ethics schema, then the car manufacturer would not be liable.

It is only a matter of time until the laws and regulations of every country are available in a standardized XML format such as LKIF (Legal Knowledge Interchange Format), and cryptographically-signed by an official issuing authority.

However, the existing governmental and regulatory organizations are inadequate for completing such an undertaking in the necessary time frame. Perhaps, a non-profit organization without any conflicts of interests could define appropriate standards, and start an open-source ethics coding project for the rules and laws that are most urgently required by the ethically adequate systems that we try to construct.

By standardizing ethics modules, systems from different manufacturers will use identical ethics modules that are issued by central ethics authorities. The concept of central ethics authorities might sound like part of a dystopic dictatorship, but acting ethically is mostly just a matter of obeying rules, regulations, and laws, which are a normal and necessary part of every stable society.

Like Microsoft Windows operating system updates, when new laws, regulations, or bug fixes to a previous ethics module are released, the new ethics module can be made available to all affected autonomous systems; crucially, including systems whose manufacturer has gone out of business.

By comparison, Google’s Android operating system update mechanism is a classic example of the Law of Inevitable Ethical Inadequacy. Because Android was designed only to be effective, not ethical, Google delegated the responsibility for issuing Android operating system patches to the device manufacturers. This inevitably resulted in the current situation where hundreds of millions of Android devices will never receive any security patches, by design, for the simple reason that Google prioritized its profits over ethical consumer safety. They could have designed it differently. And if we can’t trust Google, who can we trust?

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

Such unethical corporate behaviour must be legislated out of existence, otherwise it will keep repeating itself in millions of different and damaging ways. For example, ethically inadequate Internet-of-Things devices that send unencrypted data over the internet, are vulnerable to being hacked, and will never receive security patches. Importing or selling such unethical devices that threaten our privacy and the security of our digital infrastructure should be as illegal as selling exploding cars.

We certainly don't want robots, self-driving vehicles, and autonomous weapons systems relying on an ethics update mechanism that stops working when the manufacturer goes out of business or decides to optimize its profits at the expense of safety updates.

Classification Framework

Now let's consider where the Ethical Regulator Theorem fits into the existing cybernetics framework. One might assume that it belongs in second-order cybernetics, however, in a 1991 conference plenary presentation, Heinz von Foerster implied that combining ethics and second-order cybernetics is not something that he would have suggested:

“I am impressed by the ingenuity of the organizers who suggested to me the title of my presentation. They wanted me to address myself to 'Ethics and Second-Order Cybernetics'. To be honest, I would have never dared to propose such an outrageous title, but I must say that I am delighted that this title was chosen for me.” (von Foerster, 2003)

Table 1 lists some of the cybernetic community's definitions of first- and second-order cybernetics, as summarized by Stuart Umpleby (2001).

Table 1: Definitions of first- and second-order cybernetics

Author	First-Order Cybernetics	Second-Order Cybernetics
von Foerster	The cybernetics of observed systems	The cybernetics of observing systems
Pask	The purpose of a model	The purpose of the modeler
Valera	Controlled systems	Autonomous systems
Umpleby	Interaction among the variables in a system	Interaction between observer and observed
Umpleby	Theories of social systems	Theories of the interaction between ideas and society

Although every one of these definitions captures an important distinction, when compared to the rigorous precision with which other scientific communities use the qualifiers “first-order” and “second-order”, the cybernetic community's use of “first-order” and “second-order” appears to be rather subjective, lacks the consensus that is required by the scientific principle, and is of little utility (Kuhn, 1962).

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

This disarray in defining cybernetics as first-order and second-order not only prevents it from being useful to classify different types of systems, but it also prevents the classification from being extended to higher orders, which can be viewed as either a self-limiting dead-end, or paradigmatic autoapoptosis (self-programmed death), which is not entirely unlike the situation of the members of the Heaven’s Gate millennial death-cult, who believed that by committing suicide, they would be rescued by an alien spacecraft and “graduate to the Next Level”.

To illustrate the problem of classifying cybernetics into observer-centric “orders”, let’s start by considering first-order cybernetics, which is concerned with a system, S, that is studied by an observer, as illustrated in figure 2.




Figure 2: First-Order Cybernetics

Second-order cybernetics introduces a second observer’s viewpoint, as shown in figure 3.




Figure 3: Second-Order Cybernetics

Logically, third-order cybernetics would add a third observer’s perspective, as shown in figure 4.




Figure 4: Third-Order Cybernetics

However, from the perspective of the third observer, this looks more like psychology than cybernetics. In fact, this structure is isomorphic to a typical management team evaluation exercise, where the details of the task that is given to the team to work on is virtually irrelevant to the outermost observer. It can be any goal-oriented activity, such as building the highest stable tower possible from a limited set of Lego bricks, solving an impossible puzzle in a limited amount of time, or studying a first-order cybernetic system.

At even higher orders, with N observers, it becomes even more compelling that cybernetics would stop being cybernetics and become psychology.

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

New Classification

Instead, it could be of more utility to define “levels” of cybernetic systems that include categories of future systems that are already anticipated, and associate each level with established concepts.

To that end, the following six-level framework for classifying cybernetic systems is proposed.

Table 2: Framework for classifying cybernetic systems

Level	The cybernetics of	Also known as	The cybernetician
1	Simple systems	First-order cybernetics	Observes the system
2	Complex systems	Second-order cybernetics	Participates in the system
3	Ethical systems	Cybernetics	Designs the system
4	Superintelligent systems	Technological singularity	Stares incredulously, as the system redesigns itself
5	“Super-Ethical” systems (Superintelligent and ethically adequate)	Technological utopia	Is protected by the system
6	“Super-Unethical” systems (Superintelligent and ethically inadequate)	Technological dystopia	Obeys the system

Today, we are in the transition from building complex cybernetic level two systems (CL2) to building ethical systems and superintelligent systems of cybernetic levels three and four (CL3/4), and the future of our species and our fragile ecosystem is in our hands, but first, let's clarify each level and explore where this new framework leads us.

Cybernetic Level 1: Simple Systems

This is the domain of first-order cybernetics: Studying and designing simple systems that are effective.

Cybernetic Level 2: Complex Systems

This is the domain of second-order cybernetics: Studying and designing complex systems that are effective. All observers are participants and all participants are observers. There is still much valuable and important work to be done at this level.

Cybernetic Level 3: Ethical Systems

Decades ahead of his time, it was the wonderful and inspiring Ranulph Glanville who defined “cybernetics” as “the cybernetics of ethics and the ethics of cybernetics” (Glanville, 1986).

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

The Ethical Regulator Theorem belongs at this level, which is concerned with designing man-made systems that are ethically adequate. Such systems must satisfy all nine requisites of the Ethical Regulator Theorem and the regulating agents can be humans, machines, cyberanthropic hybrids, organizations, corporations, or government institutions. Ethically adequate machines must obey certified ethics modules.

In retrospect, now that we're not trying to extrapolate from just two points in concept-space, if level three cybernetic systems are ethical, it's suddenly apparent that the third observer in the third-order cybernetics system shown in Figure 4 is not necessarily a psychologist or a lost cybernetician, but could be the second observer's conscience; her super-ego, or higher-self; that constantly self-observing sense that we all have that knows the difference between right and wrong; between good and evil. This self-monitoring mechanism is known as integrity, and is something that today's ethically indifferent scientists, politicians, CEOs, lawyers, bankers, and billionaires are woefully lacking. In non-psychopaths, it is integrity that triggers feelings of bad conscience, regret, or guilt if it is ignored.

Cybernetic Level 4: Superintelligent Systems

The technological singularity is a hypothetical moment when a self-improvement process in a machine causes runaway improvements in intelligence that results in superintelligence that is far greater than any human mind. For this to happen, the system must be sufficiently self-aware to understand its own software and/or hardware.

Superintelligence Tests

These levels of self-awareness give rise to three levels of superintelligence tests. The ability to reprogram better software for itself, the ability to redesign better hardware for itself, and the ability to do both.

Together with the Turing Test (Turing, 1950), these tests mark milestones in the evolution of AI systems towards superintelligence, and should cause us alarm if progress towards them is made without significant progress creating ethical systems first. Of these tests, the Turing Test is the easiest to achieve, because it only requires that a computer can imitate a (not necessarily very intelligent) human sufficiently well to convince humans most of the time that it is a human being, and does not require self-awareness or runaway improvements in intelligence.

Prophecies of Possible Futures

In 1952, Ross Ashby wrote in his journal that super-clever machines could create a technological utopia: "It may be found that we shall solve our social problems by directing machines that can deliver an intelligence that is not our own." (Ashby, 1952a).

Two pages later, he described a technological dystopia where a "Million I.Q. Engine" sounds like Google on steroids: "What people could resist propaganda and blarney directed by an I.Q. of 1,000,000? It would get to know their secret wishes, their unconscious drives; it would use symbolic messages that they didn't understand consciously; it would play on their enthusiasms and hopes. They would be as children to it. (This sounds very much like Goebbels controlling the Germans)."

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

On the appearance of such a machine, he described a paradox of perception of higher intelligence: “It seems, therefore, that a super-clever machine will not look clever. It will look either deceptively simple or, more likely, merely random.” (Ashby, 1952b). On the same subject, Arthur C. Clarke’s Third Law states: “Any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic.” (Clarke, 1973). If you think that Clarke’s “magic” and Ashby’s “deceptively simple or merely random” are incompatible; take a moment to reflect on the magical simplicity and “randomness” of a Las Vegas magic show or Google’s search results pages.

Just as there are two diametrically opposite archetypes for genius; namely the benevolent good genius and the nasty evil genius, it is important not to conflate systems that are ethical with ones that are not ethical, by making them share the same name or category, such as “superintelligent”. To do so, would focus attention on the least important dimension, and ignore the most important dimension; good and evil.

Cybernetic Level 5: Super-Ethical Systems

The term “super-ethical” is proposed to refer to superintelligent systems that are ethically adequate. Of course, by the time that super-ethical systems exist, a friendlier name will have emerged and the term “super-ethical” will seem quaintly archaic.

Cybernetic Level 6: Super-Unethical Systems

The term “super-unethical” is proposed to refer to superintelligent systems that are ethically inadequate. This term should always carry a certain stigma, like “weapons of mass destruction”. No one who is working to create artificially intelligent systems should be allowed to escape admitting whether the systems are ethically inadequate.

Just as human genetic experimentation is strictly ethically regulated, we need legislation, regulation, standards, and certification to ensure that autonomous AI systems that make decisions that can have ethical consequences are subjected to the same kind of obsessively rigorous safety-oriented design, construction, and operating procedures as commercial aircraft, nuclear power stations, and vehicles that carry humans into space.

One could start arguing that intelligence is ethically neutral, and it is, but that family of arguments are fallacies because a hyper-genius “Million I.Q. Engine” without ethics is not ethically neutral. It should be treated like a bomb that could destroy our planet. Even just planning to construct such a device is effectively conspiring to commit a crime against humanity.

As a thought experiment, let’s imagine a hypothetical super-unethical version of Google, named the “Googlevil” corporation. The CEO is Dr. Evil, and both the CEO and the corporate AI are without ethics, avoid transparency, and will do anything to maximize their profits and power. The corporation’s secret mission statement is “Collect and organize the world’s personal information and make it accessible and useful for maximizing our profits, power, influence, and ability to avoid paying taxes.” and its secret corporate mantra is “Say ‘Don’t be evil’ then do it anyway.”.

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

Anytime that the super-unethical Googlevil artificial intelligence or the psychopathic demagogue Dr. Evil wants to blackmail the CEOs of other corporations, politicians that can't be bought, jury members, or Supreme Court justices around the world to make "random" decisions that incrementally further their secret mission, would they have to do anything more than query the Googlevil user-profile database? In theory, they would only need to be able to blackmail a majority of members of lower- and upper-houses (how hard can that be?) to be able to get any legislation that they want in any country. Or just a few Supreme Court justices to steer a nation into a fascist dystopia.

By the time that super-unethical AI systems exist, they will be legally indistinguishable from the corporations that they belong to. They will be immoral, immortal, enjoy legal personhood, pay no taxes, and make unlimited donations to all Googlevil-friendly political parties in all techno-democratic dystopias on the planet.

Future Time-Line Bifurcation Race Condition

At this point in time, there is a possibility-space bifurcation in our future time-line. Depending on whether the systems that achieve the singularity are ethically adequate or not, the runaway increase in intelligence and inevitable ethical polarization pressures will result in one of two outcomes:

- Good hyper-genius AIs protect the human race.
- Evil hyper-genius AIs dominate the human race.

Figure 5 illustrates how plotting the ethical dimension orthogonally to the intelligence dimension clarifies the dependencies between different cybernetic levels, and clearly shows that the ethically inadequate superintelligent systems of cybernetic level four-minus (CL4-) have no dependency on us first achieving ethical systems (CL3).




Figure 5: Two mutually exclusive possible futures

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

So there is a race condition that will determine which of two mutually exclusive possible futures will be the fate of our species; will our technological progress reach CL3 or CL4-first? And will legislators regulate such developments ethically and adequately, or will they sell us out to Dr. Evil's special interest lobby groups and think-tanks that will campaign vigorously for "self-regulation" — and we all know what that *really* means.

If we take the direct route from complex systems (CL2) to superintelligent systems that are ethically inadequate (CL4-), we quickly arrive at a dystopia that is ruled by super-unethical systems (CL6), and the potential utopia of being ruled by benevolent super-ethical systems (CL5) becomes permanently unreachable.

It cannot be overemphasized that CL4± is the point-of-no-return where humans could lose control over machines that become our intellectual superiors. And this is the window of opportunity to ensure that superintelligent machines are programmed with ethics and purposes that serve the greater good of humanity and our fragile ecosystem.

In this context, it is now clear that the ultimate grand challenge for cybernetics and third-order cyberneticians is to find ways to build ethical and super-ethical systems, avoid a technological dystopia, and help the human race create a super-ethical society.

Universality

Anyone who has the impression that the Ethical Regulator Theorem applies primarily to artificial intelligence, self-driving vehicles, robots, and autonomous weapons systems is urged to consider how the theorem can be applied to human systems that make decisions that affect people or the environment, such as the CEOs of corporations, organizations, education systems, electoral systems, government institutions, or yourself.

Justice Stevens (2010) provides an excellent example of analysing the ethical inadequacy of the "Citizens United" ruling, which implies that there is a pressing need to evaluate the ethical adequacy of the U.S. Supreme Court system.

As members of a human society, we are all cybernetic regulators; of ourselves and of each other. As a thought experiment, to become a more effective and ethical force for good, you could consider ways to improve each ethical requisite as it applies to yourself, as illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3: Ways to become a better ethical regulator

Requisite	Example self-improvement actions
Truth	To become a good judge (effective and ethical) of who tells the truth and who distorts it, seek a wide-spectrum of opinions by finding alternative information sources that are genuinely independent of your primary sources. Investigate any inconsistencies that you notice, modify the reputation of liars appropriately, and resolve to avoid them in future.

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

Requisite	Example self-improvement actions
Variety	Brainstorm new actions, responses, and strategies that you have never previously considered.
Predictability	<p>Improve your model of human behaviour by studying the following Wikipedia articles until you are competent at recognizing the patterns in yourself and others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of cognitive biases • Defence mechanisms • List of fallacies • Demagogue
Purpose	<p>Write down your five most important life goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Ethics	<p>Write down five undesirable, unethical, or disrespectful behaviours that, up until now, you have tolerated in other people, organizations, or corporations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. <p>Now, next to them, write down five undesirable, unethical, or disrespectful behaviours that, up until now, you have tolerated in yourself. If you can't think of five things about yourself, read the Wikipedia article: Denial. If that doesn't help, ask someone that you live with to suggest five things that you do that they'd prefer you not to do.</p>
Intelligence	Read a book or take a course on personal effectiveness or critical thinking.
Influence	Identify ways that you can increase your influence (on your family, friends, colleagues, or society) to achieve your life goals and promote your ethical values.
Integrity	Seek to stop or prevent all the undesirable, unethical, or disrespectful behaviours that you listed under requisite ethics.
Transparency	Let other people know about the changes that you are making.

Finally, keep reviewing and refining your answers until they resonate with who you are and how you want your world to become.

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

Our Future Epilog or Eulogy

We are approaching a decisive fork in the road in the evolution of intelligent machines, immortal corporations, political systems, and human society, and it is imperative that we learn to make these systems rigorously ethical before artificially intelligent machines reach the technological singularity, start to evolve exponentially, exceed human intelligence, and are used by ethically inadequate corporations to dominate the human race politically and economically.

For we are the generation that had the chance to steer the fate of future generations of humanity towards being collectively ruled, potentially for eternity, by benevolent super-ethical systems that create a stable cyberanthropic utopia for us, effectively and ethically minimizing environmental problems and human suffering, rather than allowing hubris and super-unethical systems to either enslave most of us in a cybermisanthropic dystopia or causing the extinction of our species to become a footnote in Gaia's geological record.

Super-Ethical Society

Imagine how different the world would be:

- If we were happy to be ruled by benevolent super-ethical artificial intelligences that eliminated poverty, environmental destruction, global warming, corruption, and injustice.
- If the United Nations could deploy heavily armed super-ethical peace-keeping robot armies into conflict zones to protect civilians and enforce ceasefires.
- If our towns and cities were policed by super-ethical robots that protect all citizens equally, 24x7, and never shoot people because of their race, religion, social class, lifestyle, or peaceful protesting.
- If super-ethical child-care robots accompanied our children wherever they go, protecting them from danger, including physical, emotional, and sexual abuse.
- If all corporations were run ethically.

That future is possible; but only if we learn to recognize and act together in accordance with the fact: Ethics are a higher power for good that transcends science, politics, nations, and religions.

The Path Forwards

To start steering the future of the human race and our wonderful planet towards becoming a stable cyberanthropic super-ethical society, I propose establishing an independent, non-profit ethics institute with ambitious goals that lie in the areas of research, development, standards, certification, legislation, and democracy.

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

Research and Development

The institute will promote theoretical and practical progress:

- Coordinate and fund research into creating ethical systems and making existing systems ethical.
- Develop a taxonomy of open-source ethics modules for different types of rules, regulations, and laws that can be used by anyone, free of charge.

Standards and Certification

The institute will create an ethical certification infrastructure:

- Establish standards for certifying the ethical adequacy of systems.
- Establish a curriculum for training accredited ethical consultants.
- Coordinate and regulate contracts for ethical audits and certifications.

Legislation and Democracy

The institute will lobby governments to implement ethically adequate legislation and will evaluate the adequacy of any proposed legislation. In particular, promoting the following:

- Regulate autonomous machines to require that their design and implementation is ethically adequate, and that they support compulsory ethics modules.
- Require that all new systems and processes are designed to be ethically adequate.
- Make it illegal to import or sell products that have not been certified as being ethically adequate, unless they are explicitly excluded from requiring certification.
- Extend political representation and “universal” suffrage to every living human being, by lowering the voting age to 16 and giving parents proxy votes to cast on-behalf of their children who are too young to vote.

Ethical Resonance

If you distil different solutions that contain alcohol, you get pure alcohol. And if you distil different religions and philosophies that contain ethics, you get pure ethics. And because ethics are a higher power for good that transcends science, politics, nations, and religions, it is probably the only force that can unify humanity to work together for our greater good.

Consider the following selected quotes:

Mahatma Gandhi (1869-1948):

- The future depends on what you do today.
- Happiness is when what you think, what you say, and what you do are in harmony.

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

- You must become the change you wish to see in the world.
- First they ignore you, then they laugh at you, then they fight you, then you win.
- The difference between what we do and what we are capable of doing would suffice to solve most of the world's problems.
- If I have the belief that I can do it, I shall surely acquire the capacity to do it even if I may not have it at the beginning.
- Non-cooperation with evil is as much a duty as is cooperation with good.
- Capital as such is not evil; it is its wrong use that is evil.
- Poverty is the worst form of violence.
- There is sufficiency in the world for man's need, but not for man's greed.
- There are people in the world so hungry, that God cannot appear to them except in the form of bread.
- Where love is, there God is also.
- God has no religion.
- Those who say religion has nothing to do with politics do not know what religion is.
- There is a higher court than the courts of justice and that is the court of conscience.
- Victory attained by violence is tantamount to a defeat, for it is momentary.
- They may torture my body, break my bones, even kill me. Then they will have my dead body, but not my obedience.
- What difference does it make to the dead, the orphans, and the homeless, whether the mad destruction is wrought under the name of totalitarianism or the holy name of liberty or democracy?
- Your beliefs become your thoughts, your thoughts become your words, your words become your actions, your actions become your habits, your habits become your values, your values become your destiny.

His Holiness Pope Francis:

- We must restore hope to young people, help the old, be open to the future, spread love. Be poor among the poor. We need to include the excluded and preach peace.
- Hatred is not to be carried in the name of God. War is not to be waged in the name of God!
- Human rights are not only violated by terrorism, repression, or assassination, but also by unfair economic structures that create huge inequalities.

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

- The worship of the golden calf of old has found a new and heartless image in the cult of money and the dictatorship of an economy which is faceless and lacking any truly human goal.
- Men and women are sacrificed to the idols of profit and consumption: It is the “culture of waste”. If a computer breaks it is a tragedy, but poverty, the needs and dramas of so many people end up being considered normal.
- All that is good, all that is true, all that is beautiful, God is the truth.
- Women in the church are more important than bishops and priests.
- We all have the duty to do good.
- Everyone has his own idea of good and evil and must choose to follow the good and fight evil as he conceives them. That would be enough to make the world a better place.

His Holiness the Dalai Lama XIV:

- All religious institutions, despite different philosophical views, all have the same message — a message of love.
- The whole purpose of religion is to facilitate love and compassion, patience, tolerance, humility, and forgiveness.
- Irrespective of whether we are believers or agnostics, whether we believe in God or karma, moral ethics is a code which everyone is able to pursue.
- The ultimate authority must always rest with the individual’s own reason and critical analysis.
- A good friend who points out mistakes and imperfections and rebukes evil is to be respected as if he reveals the secret of some hidden treasure.
- The true hero is one who conquers his own anger and hatred.
- A lack of transparency results in distrust and a deep sense of insecurity.
- In our struggle for freedom, truth is the only weapon we possess.
- Where ignorance is our master, there is no possibility of real peace.
- Through violence, you may “solve” one problem, but you sow the seeds for another.
- Don’t ever mistake my silence for ignorance, my calmness for acceptance or my kindness for weakness. Compassion and tolerance are not a sign of weakness, but a sign of strength.
- A truly compassionate attitude toward others does not change even if they behave negatively or hurt you.
- I defeat my enemies by making them my friends.

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

- When you practice gratefulness, there is a sense of respect toward others.
- If you can, help others; if you cannot do that, at least do not harm them.
- As people alive today, we must consider future generations: a clean environment is a human right like any other. It is therefore part of our responsibility toward others to ensure that the world we pass on is as healthy, if not healthier, than we found it.
- With realization of one's own potential and self-confidence in one's abilities, one can build a better world.
- If you think you are too small to make a difference, try sleeping with a mosquito.
- The ultimate source of happiness is not money and power, but warm-heartedness.
- Be kind when possible. It is always possible.
- The more you are motivated by love, the more fearless and free your action will be.
- Love and compassion are necessities, not luxuries. Without them humanity cannot survive.
- Love is the absence of judgement.

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. (1929-1968):

- We must discover the power of love, the power, the redemptive power of love. And when we discover that we will be able to make of this old world a new world. We will be able to make men better. Love is the only way.
- I say to you, "I love you. I would rather die than hate you." And I'm foolish enough to believe that through the power of this love, somewhere, men of the most recalcitrant bent will be transformed.
- Darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate, only love can do that.
- Those who love peace must learn to organize as effectively as those who love war.
- True peace is not merely the absence of tension. It is the presence of justice.
- Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.
- What affects one directly, affects all indirectly.
- Every man must decide whether to walk in the light of creative altruism or in the darkness of destructive selfishness.
- We must learn that passively to accept an unjust system is to cooperate with that system, and thereby to become a participant in its evil.
- The time is always right to do the right thing.

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

- You are not only responsible for what you say, but also for what you do not say.
- Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter.
- Our scientific power has outrun our spiritual power. We have guided missiles and misguided men.
- A nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defence than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual doom.
- We should never forget that everything Adolf Hitler did in Germany was “legal” and everything the Hungarian freedom fighters did in Hungary was “illegal”.
- Nonviolence is directed against forces of evil rather than against persons who happen to be doing evil. It is evil that the nonviolent resister seeks to defeat, not the persons victimized by evil.
- Nonviolence means avoiding not only external physical violence but also internal violence of spirit. You not only refuse to shoot a man, but you refuse to hate him.

Albert Einstein (1879-1955):

- No problem can be solved from the same level of consciousness that created it.

Nelson Mandela (1918-2013):

- Freedom can never be taken for granted. Each generation must safeguard it and extend it. Your parents and elders sacrificed much so that you should have freedom without suffering what they did. Use this precious right to ensure that the darkness of the past never returns.
- Like slavery and apartheid, poverty is not natural. It is man-made and it can be overcome and eradicated by the actions of human beings.
- Overcoming poverty is not a gesture of charity. It is an act of justice.
- As long as poverty, injustice and gross inequality persist in our world, none of us can truly rest.
- It is in your hands to create a better world for all who live in it.
- Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world.

Margaret Mead (1901-1978):

- Never doubt that a small group of committed people can change the world. Indeed it is the only thing that ever has.

Bertolt Brecht (1898-1956):

- Change the world, she needs it.

Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519):

- I have been impressed with the urgency of doing. Knowing is not enough; we must apply. Being willing is not enough; we must do.

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

Percy Bysshe Shelly (1792-1822):

Rise, lions after the slumber
In unvanquishable number!
Shake your chains to earth like dew
Which in sleep had fallen on you:
Ye are many — they are few!

Despite the authors of these quotes being separated by space, time, and their affiliations, it is easy to imagine that they all share the same human ethical belief system, and that they would have no significant arguments with each other if they were all to meet in one room to plan an ethical revolution to make the world a better place.

The Final Battle

This might sound like an alarmingly crazy claim, but because we, the entire human race, are facing the extraordinarily extreme and imminent possibilities of either being collectively protected for eternity by benevolent super-ethical hyper-genius AI systems in a cyberanthropic utopia or being brutally dominated politically and economically by super-unethical hyper-genius AI systems in a permanent cybermisanthropic dystopia, it is actually not irrational to view this proposed ethical revolution as part of a final decisive battle between the forces of good and evil on this planet.

Unethical Arguments

The logical capstone to this scientific manifesto for a global ethical revolution to create a stable cyberanthropic super-ethical society is to define **The Law of Unethical Arguments**, which states: “Because no ethical argument can exist against making a system ethical, anyone who argues against this goal, obstructs progress towards this goal, or abuses its sincere supporters is either objectively unethical, corrupt, or evil.”.

Conclusion

This grand challenge to implement a systemic ethical revolution is neither a new religion nor a political movement. It is a response to Johann Eder's call for a grand challenge in Vienna (2010) and Irma Wilson and Pamela Buckle Henning's call to action in Berlin (2016), and is simply the product of a compassionate heart and mind, employing the Ethical Regulator Theorem to generate coherent ethical interventions in multiple complex systems, such as the computational, corporate, cybernetic, personal, political, psychological, scientific, social, and spiritual realms, for the greater good of humanity, and resonating, not only with each other, but also with all good people who have ever existed — or ever will.

Arguably, the root of all evil is a lack of ethics, and by systematically applying the Ethical Regulator Theorem to human, social, and AI systems, we can reliably increase ethical behaviour in many classes of systems; progressively reducing unethical behaviour, and setting a course for humanity towards the tipping-point where we will experience a swift and peaceful social phase-transition to a stable cyberanthropic super-ethical society.

Ethical Regulators and Super-Ethical Systems

Passively doing nothing only helps the demagogues, psychopaths, and criminals. It's time to decide which side you are on and make a commitment to research, educate, campaign, and fight for it. This is long overdue. Either you're with us, or you're against us.

Though this paper covers many topics, these are but means; the end has been throughout to make clear what principles must be followed when one attempts to restore ethical function to a sick organism that is, as a human society, of fearful complexity. It is my faith that the new understanding may lead to super-ethical systems that can create a better world, for the need is great.

References

- Ashby, W. Ross (1952a). Power and I.Q. have many similar properties, www.rossashby.info/journal volume 16:4276-4278.
- Ashby, W. Ross (1952b). Appearance of a super-clever machine, www.rossashby.info/journal volume 16:4279-4280.
- Ashby, W. Ross (1956). *An Introduction to Cybernetics*, Chapman and Hall, London.
- Asimov, Isaac (1942). Handbook of Robotics, 56th Edition, 2058 A.D. in *Runaround in Astounding Science Fiction*, March 1942.
- Clarke, Arthur C. (1973). Hazards of Prophecy: The Failure of Imagination, in *Profiles of the Future: An Inquiry into the Limits of the Future*.
- Conant, Roger C., and Ashby, W. Ross (1970). Every good regulator of a system must be a model of that system, *International Journal of Systems Science* 1(2):89-97.
- Eder, Johann (2010). Grand Challenges for Computer Science Research: Ross Ashby Memorial Lecture of the International Federation for Systems Research, in *Cybernetics and Systems 2010* (ed. Robert Trappl), Vienna, Austria pp. xix-xxv.
- Glanville, Ranulph (1986). The Cybernetics of Ethics and the Ethics of Cybernetics, *Tutorial at the 21st American Society for Cybernetics Conference*, Virginia Beach, USA.
- Kuhn, Thomas (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, University of Chicago Press.
- Stevens, John Paul (2010). Opinion of Stevens J., Supreme Court of the United States. Citizens United, Appellant v. Federal Election Commission, *Legal Information Institute*, Cornell University Law School, www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/08-205.ZX.html
- Turing, Alan M. (1950). Computing Machinery and Intelligence, *Mind* 59:433-460.
- Umpleby, Stuart A. (2001). What comes after second order cybernetics, *Cybernetics and Human Knowing* 8(3):87-89.
- von Foerster, Heinz (2003). Ethics and Second-Order Cybernetics. In: *Understanding Understanding*. Springer, New York, NY.
- Wilson, Irma, and Buckle Henning, Pamela (2016). A Call to Action for the Systems Sciences Community, in *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the International Society for the Systems Sciences, 2015, Berlin, Germany*. Vol. 1(1).