Mechanics of Instinct

According to the news, a South Korean Go master 이세돌 (Lee Sedol) has already been defeated twice by an artificial intelligence (A.I.) named 'AlphaGo' developed by Google. To cut short, the shock and fear around the two matches are due to the fact that an A.I. was able to outsmart a human intelligence. We have come to the point in which our product is more intelligent than us; computer used to *serve* us, then it used to *shape* us, then it makes us *fear* it. Although there can be, and are, countless discussions revolving around the use, possible effects, pros and cons of A.I., our focus here is on briefly comparing the clockwork of A.I. with that of human beings to make a statement about "instincts".

What we call "instincts," which their natures in terms of what they are and how they are formed for human beings are unanswered and remain as highly abstracted concepts, are clearly defined for an A.I., for the nature of an A.I. is preprogrammed before it sees the world. Because "instinctive actions" is a set of seemingly *repetitively fixed reactions* to some other action(s) motivated by another being(s) or by from within and of its own self, "instincts" of an A.I. are the very first set of commands that were programmed for the A.I. to react to certain situations in 'repetitively fixed' manner. And every time an executed 'repetitively fixed reaction' to a certain problem does not solve the problem immediately (i.e. when an "instinctive action" disagrees with the aim of its motivation), A.I. learns. Humans too learn this way: for example, when we eat a very hot pepper by mistake (or on purpose) we "instinctively" go for a cup of liquid in order to cool the hotness of the pepper, but we realize that our "instinctive action" did not work when we feel the hotness of the pepper lingering on the two edges of our tongue – after having such painful experience, a person (when next time he eats a pepper) may go for a bowl of rice instead of a cup of liquid to put down the heat. Another example is embedded in the saying "we learn from our mistakes" (but note that when we make our mistakes, we do not know we are making a mistake but rather *believe* that we are doing something right – *we instinctively believe on something illogical or nonsensical until we are disillusioned by the resulting experience of pain, loss, trauma, etc.*). So the set of "repetitively fixed reactions" are set of "instinctive actions," which altogether are *belief*.

By drawing our comparison between A.I. and human beings in this quick paper, we can see that the modes of learning for both A.I. and humans are highly systematical and mechanical (both A.I. and humans learn through experience by applying their "instincts" to different situations and seeing how they work out). As such, what we call "instincts" too are as mechanical and systematical as *believing*[1] the illogic or the nonsense rather than being attributed to logical reactions such as love, feelings and emotions[2].

<div align="right">

Alexander Kang
2016/03/11
Shanghai, China

</div>

---

[1] Believing is mechanical and systematical in a sense that it is preprogrammed in us and in A.I. as the "instinct" in order for us to apply our beliefs to our experience and learn.
[2] Love, feelings and emotions are logical, for they are reactions caused by some motivations with psychological aims as opposed to *belief*, which has no aim and is absolutely *unconditional*.