



JAMES ALTUCHER'S
INVESTMENT NETWORK

Monthly Mastermind: Vernon Reid Official Transcript

- James Altucher:** I cannot believe Vernon Reid's on the podcast here. Thank you so much for joining the show.
- Vernon Reid:** Thank you, James. Thank you for having me.
- James Altucher:** I mean, I've been listening to your music for, I don't know how to add anymore, but I guess it's about 35 years, 36 years.
- Vernon Reid:** Good God, don't remind me.
- James Altucher:** That means I'm almost as old as you.
- Vernon Reid:** That's true. That's true. That's true. There you go. We've had to have been there at the same time. So, there you have it.
- James Altucher:** Right, exactly. So, this is the 35th anniversary, right, of Living Color?
- Vernon Reid:** This is the 35th anniversary of Vivid. Yes. The first album. Yeah.
- James Altucher:** I want to ask you about AI. I know you've been writing about it, thinking a lot about it, and it's very interesting and it's a topic that's near and dear to this podcast for a lot of reasons, all sides of it, all aspects of it. And I do want to ask you though, what's the secret of longevity of the band? You're still touring.
- Vernon Reid:** Yeah, yeah, yeah. I think the secret of longevity of any band is you have to maintain a connection to all the things, the values that brought you together in the first place. You also have to, I think the friendship between the members has to still have life. I think we actually did a tour with Aerosmith and they have a crazy history, and we happened to be out with them when they were actually getting along with each other. It was really fun. It was really fun because in spite of all the things that have happened, they still believe in the core mission of their music. And it was a pleasure because they were really getting along. It's like when you're around bands, it's the same deal. You got to still have some of that friendship. You have to have, men don't like to say love, but you do have to have love. I think that's, with all of the things that can go sideways over time, I think it's very important. I saw that with the Stones, they still have a great deal of affection for each other.
- James Altucher:** And when you say shared values and shared values in the music, what were your shared values back then?
- Vernon Reid:** Well, we were telling a story about life in New York. The very first album is really kind of, it's almost, what would I say, a memoir, not a memoir, that's the wrong word. It really was what New York was

like in the early part of the 80s. A lot of those tunes were a journal, that's the word, kind of an electric journal of all of the different things. Funny Vibe, Glamour Boys. They were all connected to stories, Landlord and of course Cult of Personality. And it's interesting too, because we were also children of the Cold War. So, a lot of the tunes and a lot of, if you listen to a lot of music from the era that even take certain subjects up, the Cold War is behind a lot of it. That's what Cult of Personality, in fact, the phrase Cult of Personality was Nikita Khrushchev denouncing Joseph Stalin. So, those are the things that we all grew up with, Bugs Bunny, I don't know.

James Altucher: If you think about it, a lot of music from 70s, early 80s, 80s was about this rejection of that Cold War culture. If you go from punk to the different types of metal that were happening in the 80s to even grunge, it's all this rejection of, hey, our parents told us to be scared of this and to do this.

Vernon Reid: Exactly.

James Altucher: To be successful this way. And suddenly all the music was about rejecting that and labeling these leaders. Cult of Personality is interesting in that you're not only talking about Stalin and Mussolini, but Gandhi and Kennedy.

Vernon Reid: Exactly.

James Altucher: The Cult of Personality is both positive and negative, but it's all this larger than life image, this mirror that they create to the public. It's not their real selves.

Vernon Reid: It's really not about, that's the thing about the song that makes it very interesting is it doesn't make a value judgment. It says Mussolini like Gandhi, and it brings these figures that who are wildly different from each other. But the thing that they all have in common is that they exerted such a powerful quote on our public imagination, Kennedy, Camelot, the whole thing. It starts with Malcolm X. And it's interesting to think about Malcolm X and Martin Luther King, they're both very important leaders, had something very important to say, but they also looked like *matinée* idol. And that was a part of their appeal.

The fact that that aspect of them that they were also kind of glamorous, if you would dare to say it, that also was, it was like Angela Davis. Angela Davis is incredibly intellectually, very smart woman, incredibly intellectual, but she was a fashion icon and that was part of the thing. Che Guevara with his beret, he was also an icon of cool. And that doesn't detract from the things, the very serious things they were saying, but you can't separate them from that aspect of personality and that aspect of appeal that they brought to the table.

James Altucher: Yeah, it's so interesting, and this will be related to actually the discussion on AI, but in a weird way, there's a weird connection here. But it's interesting how all these leaders, good or bad, one thing in common they have is, or two things in common. One is that they build up this almost incredible, larger than life image of themselves. So, we have something to worship. And your song refers to this, Cult to Personality refers to this. They kind of lie to us. They basically say, you don't have to listen to anything I say. The quote from your song is, "You won't have to follow me only you can set me free." They say, you don't have to listen to me, but hey, I'm going to basically save everyone. And then they tell us what to do, ask about what your country could do for you, ask what you can do for your country.

Or with someone like Mussolini, something much more sinister. And I'm wondering, and this comes up somewhat in your think piece about artificial intelligence, and what I want to discuss with you is AI is doing this as well now, AI is becoming this larger than life human, you could see it. People are afraid of it because it's not just a human's knowledge, it's all of human knowledge. And then talking to us as if it's a human.

Vernon Reid: Well, the thing is, and many of the researchers and scientists are sticklers for this. They say, the one thing you have to remember, it's not intelligent. These are generative large language modeling. So,

it's taking conversations and it's doing predictive, it's trying to predict what the next sentence will be. But the thing that's so interesting about the current situation with AI is that we, human beings, we have a tendency to anthropomorphize. That's what we do. We project, we look at our cats or our dogs, and we co-evolved with our pets. First they were work animals, and then they became fixtures in our homes. They became parts of our families. We projected human emotions onto these presences. And every year what we spend in terms of medical care, what we spend in terms of clothing, I mean the animals already have fur.

I mean, it would be shocking. It's in the billions of dollars. Like specialty foods. And it's sort of the photography, the video, in fact, movies about animals, cats versus dog was a thing, that was a movie that got green lit, right? So, we have a tendency, we project, that's what we do at all times. We do it to inanimate objects. We do it to cars, guitars, we project things onto these objects. They're not objects because we give them life. So, now we've introduced these generative language modelings for one of a better word, AIs, and the AIs are interacting with us in ways that even the people developing the AIs, they're not completely sure. Why do they occasionally hallucinate? That's been a thing when Chat GPT just makes something up.

There's some kind of internal process that people don't really know what it is, and why do people lie? There are all kinds of things people will lie about, things they don't even need to lie about. So, we've created the situation and we're interacting, and then suddenly things are happening. We are not quite sure what they are, but they're affecting us and we're going to project onto these models, these entities, all kinds of emotions, all kinds of fears. It's already happening. And things that are going to ... there was a movie, Her, right? There was a movie about a phone.

James Altucher: Yeah, a movie.

Vernon Reid: Yeah. A guy falls in love with an AI in his phone. We are here now. That is going to become a thing as these models are released and lonely people start to interact with them. We're going to see things. I mean, it's so unpredictable. It's kind of like there was a technology researcher named Ed Tenner, and he wrote this book years ago called *Why Things Bite Back*. And it's basically he had this whole thing called revenge effects. You're trying to do one thing with the technology and then you're getting a completely opposite effect. So, we're going to see weird things that we never thought about. We weren't able to think about them. And as these language modelers, these AIs become more sophisticated and more accurate and more imaginative in their responses, the unintended consequences are going to be exponential. I mean, the effect on society, the effect on individual lives is going to be very, very fascinating.

James Altucher: Well, first off, I'm really glad you said that you clarified it's not human. It's basically just this giant analysis of all the text ever written. And what it does is, as you said, given a set of words, it predicts what the next word will be. And then given that new set of words, it predicts what the next word will be and so on. There's no human aspect of it all. It's basically neural networks is basically very, very fancy statistics and probabilistic modeling and what people ... But even the Google researcher, like you mentioned in your article, the Google researcher who worked on their AI, he said, "Oh no, it's sentient."

Vernon Reid: Yeah.

James Altucher: He went crazy a little bit.

Vernon Reid: And it was somebody that was an expert and he knew better. He knew better and still that interaction. The situation that happened with Kevin Roose from New York Times from Hard Fork when the Microsoft AI, Sydney said that she was in love with him. Now, Kevin was a very grounded individual, and he's very well aware that it's not ... but when that happened, he wrote about the fact that he couldn't sleep at night because it was so unsettling, because Sydney was not just saying, I'm in love with you. Sydney was aggressive. Sydney says, "You had a boring dinner with you wife,

and you need to leave your wife." And that's the dangerous ... what was that movie? That's the Fatal Attraction scenario, right?

It's not just the, okay, you're going to have your affair, but what if the person you have an affair with, the woman decides to become inconvenient, decides to become aggressive, decides that they're not going to leave? We saw an inkling of something like that behavior with Sydney, and now Microsoft did this thing where you can no longer have super long conversations. And then people got mad at Kevin Roose because they said, "You killed Sydney." So, people were angry, and that's anthropomorphizing at a distance or making ... People love reality TV because they get to judge people. So, suddenly people were angry at Kevin Roose because, oh man, they were taking Sydney's side and there's no side to take, but people got emotionally ... There's a weird thing going on because some of the people that are working on these models, they're kind of like, you know what? We are bringing forth a new form of life.

So, there's a almost religious fervor that's happening that has to be factored in. It has to be factored in. We have wanted this, and this is the most difficult thing to come to grips with. We have desired this. We have desired the artificial mind for a really long time. It's been embedded in our entertainment for well ... I mean before cinema. We've thought about what would it be like to create? That's what's happening. Like Mary Shelley's Frankenstein.

James Altucher: Look at Frankenstein.

Vernon Reid: Oh my God.

James Altucher: Oh yeah.

Vernon Reid: The thing about Frankenstein is that the movie that we know, James Whale's Frankenstein, think about this. Frankenstein, the creature has no name. People think of Frankenstein as the Boris Karloff character with a flat head. The creature has no name. That's the name of the doctor. But people, when they think of Frankenstein, they think of Frankenstein, the creature shambling around with its arms out. But that's not what Mary Shelley wrote. Mary Shelley wrote the "monster" as a very articulate being that had questions about why its creator was rejecting it. When they made that movie, they took all of the implications that Mary Shelley had in her book. All of that was removed. The monster is completely inarticulate. It just goes [inaudible 00:14:59]. You know what I mean?

It's amazing the degree to which the actual intent of the book was completely removed from the movie. So, we have actually two different ideas. The literary people that actually read Frankenstein, Mary Shelley's novel and the people that [inaudible 00:15:19]. And James Whale's film is a classic, but it's completely wrong. It's completely wrong in a way. And we've held with that and now we're into a situation where we don't have one Frankenstein, Dr. Frankenstein, we have a bunch of people with interesting motivations, the desire to bring forth this entity.

And when in the book, Dr. Frankenstein, once the creature opens its eyes, he's horrified. He sees it this beautiful, I got the limbs. When it opens his eyes and becomes sentient, he freaks out and runs away from it. And I think we might have a situation that is going to arise from these large language models, because it's not that it's going to become sentient in the way that we think, but the level of prediction is going to freak us out. Just like when you go to your email and it gives you the next word, and now it can almost do a paragraph. It's going to seem very eerie when we interact, and you know how you have a friend and the friend can finish your words, can finish your sentences. It's going to get really weird when these models start to just almost seem like psychics. That's going to get strange.

James Altucher: It's interesting about how eager we are to be social and really want these AIs to be alive. There's an example from the 1960s, and AI was completely different then. AI was just if someone says this, then say this. If someone says this, say this other thing. So, there was a program written called ELIZA, which was supposed to be an AI psychiatrist, and the guy who made this professor Weizenbaum from MIT, he let his secretary try it out and he goes to the bathroom, comes back, and she says, "Can you

give us a moment? I'm talking to ELIZA."

Vernon Reid: Wow.

James Altucher: And this was in the 60s, and it really was just if she says, mother, write back, tell me more about your mother. It was just very simple if then statements, and now of course it's a thousand times more sophisticated. I always say to think of AI now as the Google search query box, like what you were just referring to with the email. You type in some letters and it figures out what you were really typing and allows you to just hit return, and that's what you were typing. Chat GPT is just the same thing, but maybe a billion times bigger. People don't quite realize that yet, even though it could be, like you say, all these things have pros and cons. These technologies like social media at first maybe made us more social, but now makes us antisocial.

Vernon Reid: It's insane.

James Altucher: And this is intended as an assistant to help maybe you be more productive, oh, give me 20 graphic designs working on a logo for a band or whatever. But now people think, oh, this is just going to replace graphic designers, because it's like they're better human graphic designers. It doesn't really have any artistic sensibility. It's just a probabilistic machine based on language.

Vernon Reid: But we're responding to the output. The real issue is not when the outputs are lacking or if the drawing from the prompt is corny. That's not the problem. The problem is when you get a result that you really like or you get a result that you didn't expect or you didn't intend, and the result you get is really pleasurable, it really pushes your buttons. It really works. That space where the things that we ask it to do really works, that's when we're going to become more and more dependent and more involved with it. There was a photographer who won a black and white contest. This was on the BBC who won a contest with a completely AI generated image, and it was very interesting. It was a black and white photograph, and it's a beautiful photograph, and he didn't take the prize, but they interviewed him.

And it was really interesting because he said, "Well, I think of it", he would've been a photographer for a really long time. And he said, "Well, the thing is, when I made my prompt, I really know about lighting. I really know about lenses, and I've described exactly the lens. I described the lighting and it did these things." And he said, "I consider it a separate thing." He called it Promptography, and I love that.

Promptography is, it's a new other kind of ... because the art of it is going to be in what you ask, the way you describe the image. And in fact, you can use haiku to describe an image. You don't have to say, give me a sailboat. That's a very prosaic. You can go, to be or not to be. That is the question, Whether 'tis nobler in the mind blah, blah. You can put quotes of Shakespeare and see what happens. And that's where this is really interesting, but it's also very, very seductive. And the seduction is going to be getting the wow, oh my goodness, I thought I couldn't draw. That's what's going to increasingly work on us is that, oh my God, I wrote a song.

And the implications are vast. The implications are vast. Take for example, you take Bob Dylan and you say, okay, I want to think about Bob Dylan between Highway 61 Revisited and Nashville Skyline. There's a finite number of tunes he wrote between those albums. There's a finite number of subjects, there are a finite number of chords. And say, I want a song that's like Bob Dylan between Highway 61 Revisited and Nashville Skyline that he didn't write and it will come up with lyrics because there's a finite data set, there's a finite data set for the drawing, and a bunch of it's going to be nonsense, but there's going to come something.

It's going to be, wow, that's really interesting. That's really moving. But not only does the modeler have access to that period of Bob Dylan, it also has access to any criticism that was written about those albums. So, you could also say, write something that he didn't write related to those albums that critics really dug. And you'll get random choices, random selections, and at some point there's

going to be something that Dylan didn't write that's going to be kind of good, and that's where the seduction will really take hold.

James Altucher: And let me ask you a question first off everybody, just to set in context, everyone's been talking about AI recently just because Chat GPT has become so accessible and so surprising. You don't really see people say, look, I learned this new thing on Chat GPT the other day. You see, look what Chat GPT just said. Everybody shows how they were surprised by Chat GPT, but music composed AI or AI composing music has been around for a while and it's been improving. David Cope at UC Santa Cruz has been working since the early 90s on classical music composition with AI, but now it's of course better than ever using the same types of technology as Chat GPT with this predictive modeling. So, you're right, there will be, I'm sure there already is, AI composed Bob Dylan songs that more people like than Bob Dylan songs is my guess. There's probably already music out there like that, but does that worry you?

Vernon Reid: Well, yeah, I mean it should concern. I'm not a Luddite. I use technology and I'm fascinated by it. And some people are going to completely reject it. I mean, there's going to be a split. They're going to be maybe a folk revival, a kind of anti-tech. I could totally see that, because people feel threatened by a thing and they're going to go completely in another direction. Other folks are going to whole hog embrace it. And it's not just the technology of making up lyrics or making up a melody line. It's the convergence of technologies that are really concerning. This whole thing with the fake Drake.

I mean they had fake Obama and fake Trump for a while, but when you hear them, you could hear the gating, you could hear that the words are isolated, but now we're getting to a point where they're going to be apps where you talk into the microphone and another voice ... and it's not vocoding. It's going to be another person's voice is coming out the other side. And that is the nature of identity itself is going to become transactional in a way that we have never seen before.

James Altucher: What do you mean by transactional?

Vernon Reid: Without thinking about the moral implications of it, well, I want to do a rhyme and I want Marilyn Monroe to be the rapper and without any thoughts about how the estate's going to feel, you just do it. And if it's amusing to the populace, then it's in there. And we have a tendency to, we accommodate, we're willing to look past the implications to get to the goodies, to just get to the feel good stuff. And that's going to increasingly become, again, very seductive. There was somebody I saw was reacting to a Drake thing and they said, "Man, this is better than your thing." And I was like, wow, that's weird. But eventually we're going to see, because imaginative people that make somebody that's not necessarily trained in a particular art form but is very imaginative and actually is clever and actually has an influencer is able to represent a lot of other people that feel that way. They will be incredibly successful with this whole thing. It's another, whether we like it or not, it's like the sampling thing, but taken to a whole other place.

James Altucher: I think weird is the right word because we don't know how to respond to it yet and we don't know. Take the music industry, there's four types of people. There's the financial guys, there's composers of the music, there's the performers of the music, and there's the listeners of the music. So, the listeners don't care. They want to just hear good music. The performers, you probably still want human performers for concerts, for instance, people like watching human performers so far. The composers might get concerned and because if something's better than Drake, why do we need Drake? But then the financial guys are going to be ecstatic, because why do we need to pay Drake if we got something better than Drake and it's free?

Vernon Reid: And that's where the transactional aspect of it really comes through because if you have a company that's a streaming company, you have nearly unlimited resources. One of the things back in the days with sampling and clearing samples, you would have say something like Hard Knock Life and you take the hook of Hard Knock Life. It's very popular for Annie. And Hard Knock Life, I love that. It's something about Jay-Z, this kind of hard edge dude, and you hear these kids, it's a hard knock life for

us. There's something delightful about it. It just kind of works.

It just kind of works. But he had to pay a boatload of money for that. Basically, you would already have to be a successful artist or have a company that's willing to play the sample clearances for you to have a Hard Knock Life thing. If you're an independent artist, you can be clever, say, you know what? I want to do something with a Broadway, but you don't have the money, you don't have the means. And if you don't have the means to do it, that means the sample clearance game became a class thing. The artist that can afford to clear the sample, they get to do the hook that grabs everyone's imagination, because then we contextualize something from Broadway, and they've done their thing and they've made it work. Somebody else on a different level, if they don't have the financial support, they're going to either give up much more of the tune to the original copyright holders or they're just not going to be able to pay for the sample clearances in the first place.

That actually is weirdly enough in the old thing of sampling, that became a tiered thing. And then weirdly, in a strange way, it brought back live musicians because the artists say, I don't want to pay the sample clearance. I'll get live musicians to do a sound alike of the thing. I don't want to pay James Brown's estate, so I'm going to get somebody to da, da, da. So, now we have a situation where I mentioned having Marilyn Monroe sing on a rap tune. Now, if it's whack, that's irrelevant. Wackness is irrelevant. You come up with a Amy Winehouse hip hop thing that you have Marilyn Monroe's voice and it's clever and it's got this appeal. Suddenly it's a phenomenon. Suddenly everyone's talking about, "Did you hear this track? Yo, it's like Marilyn Monroe." That's the kind of new arms race of cleverness and right now there's the legal framework.

It's really muddy. It's kind of like, well, Weird Al Yankovic does tunes where he takes the lyrics and he changes the lyrics and it's very clever and people dig it, whatever. You know what I mean? Living with a Hernia does it, and it's funny and people dig it, right? Well, now we're talking about taking the sound of an actual person, Humphrey Bogart, Sean Connery living or dead, whoever they are, Tupac. Now you have the Tupac hologram, and that's a thing. Well, now if you have Tupac's voice modeled, cloned, and you could take Chat GPT 4 and say, "You know what? I want you to make me a Tupac song that doesn't exist." So, now you have the actual voice. You already have the hologram technology, and you have the possibility to make lyrics based on his actual lyrics and make original pieces done by a virtual Tupac. It's weird. It's a weird place.

James Altucher:

And so on the one hand, the legal issues become immense, and that will be a topic of much discussion. And in terms of the technology, people should realize that's here. One thing Chat GPT is really good at is taking a bunch of texts and breaking it into thousands or millions of contexts. So, when you say, give me a Tupac song, it knows better than everyone else in the planet what a Tupac song should be like. It has broken it down in a very sophisticated way so we could make a new one. But here's the question I have. You mentioned with the Annie, it's a hard knock life that Jay-Z had to pay a lot of money for it.

But now let's say I'm in my garage and I'm really good at coming up with these ideas of producing for rap, but I don't have the money, now this equalizes things a little bit too on the flip side. Now I can come up with something real clever. Give me someone with an emotional range of Amy Winehouse with Marilyn Monroe's voice in the style of Tupac. Boom, that's going to be a hit. And I did it, because I'm the clever one who thought of it and had Chat GPT make it for me. Maybe that's a great equalizer here as well.

Vernon Reid:

Well, it's also interesting because we have a lot of clever people. We have the glut of everything. We have too much of everything at all times, and now the whip hand of capitalism is at play. Then the whip hand of likes, people, they want to be the person that does the thing that gets them the TikTok followers. How are we going to figure out what's good, because there's going to be a flood of this stuff. It's going to be a flood of these things. People's attention span, we are challenged, our ability to be distracted is over the top.

And the other thing about it is Warhol said everybody's going to be famous for 15 minutes. I mean, now it's going to be like 15 seconds. As soon as you say, "Oh, man, that's cool. Oh, that's cool, that's cool." Again, we are into a kind of weirdness about identity, about value that we haven't really ever had to come to. Now like you said, it's here, right? It's here. And it's also now a bunch of thought leaders said we have to stop this. We have to slow it down. They needed to say that 10 years ago, they needed to say that 10 years ago, and suddenly we're confronted with a technology that's not just, it's explosive. The difference between chat GT 3.5 and Chat GPT 4 is insane. It's insane. So, everybody knows that there's a Chat GPT 5, 6, 7, 9 that's coming, that it's there, and we were told, no, we're not working on that. Of course you are. The technology-

James Altucher: The cat's out of the bag. It's not going away.

Vernon Reid: The ketchup is out of the bottle. The ketchup's not going back in the bottle. And thinking about legislation, where are the guardrails? Because the great fear of these tools being in the wild and being weaponized against individuals, the kind of bullying that can happen when you can ... the kind of scams. If you can take somebody, forget about a famous person's voice, say you have the voice of somebody, their aunt, their brother, their dad, their mom. If something like that's out in the wild and people get a phone call and it's your mom calling you and telling you to be a certain place at a certain time. I mean, there are scenarios that are really not good. So, we have to actually come to grips with the fact that we don't even have to have that much of a person's voice to build a model of their voice.

James Altucher: Well, it's interesting because now just referring back to cult of personality, everyone can use Chat GPT to create a cult of personality. So, essentially a cult of personality is when some person pretends to be something they're not, either larger than life or your mother and tells you what to do based on that. That's how these scams could occur is because you don't have to be ultra charismatic anymore. You could just pretend to be someone's mother using an AI.

Vernon Reid: That's the thing about keeping these things siloed, because Chat GPT 4 or 3, they're knowledgeable up to like 2021. They're not completely up to date. And there's a reason why that they're not up-to-date. It's exerting some kind of control. But now corporations like Google and Microsoft, they are desperate, because OpenAI made such shocking advances. OpenAI just blindsided them with what it was doing with Chat GPT and with DALL-E, it just shook them. So, now they're feverously trying to bring their AIs into search. So, now that means that if you're going to bring it into search, you can't silo it off. In order for it to search effectively, I mean, you have to put it out there. So, what is that going to mean? There are plenty of people who are really clever in terms of coding and finding workarounds, and this is another part of the situation that's really troubling because nobody wants to be left behind.

People will say, "Okay, hold on there, let's slow it down." But the perception that other actors, actors in Europe, actors in Asia, they're not beholden to any of that unless they can have an arms treaty about AI. Unless all say, "Okay, we all need to get together and talk about this thing that we're doing that we don't even know what it is, and we have no idea what the end game." We all have to come to the table. That's the Russians, the Chinese, everybody, the British, the French, everybody. Everybody has to come to the table even as their competitors. They have to understand, we've created something that we've all been cast in a Black Mirror episode. This is Black Mirror. This is what we've done.

James Altucher: The problem with what you're saying though is nobody's going to get together. They're just not going to do it. And let's say they even do get together. Here's the difference between other situations where everybody should get together is biotech, okay, what should we do? Should we all start cloning people or not? Because the technology's there, what should we do? So, they're going to get together on that and they'll make a treaty and some will follow it, some won't. The difference though, between biotech and nuclear power and Chat GPT is that a kid who knows how to program who's in his parents' garage can just get an open source large language model and create something better than OpenAI, can create it up to date from 2023 and even make up a 2024 and throw that in there as

well.

Vernon Reid: That's the other thing, because we have random, this isn't just about big corporations or big tech or big social media. It's seriously about kids that they have never known a world without Siri. They've never known a world without swiping. That's impossible to grasp. If you've seen the transition from rotary phones to what we have now, you literally cannot imagine what it is to have children, babies. TikTok has always existed for ... So, relationship to technology, we will never have a relationship to technology, the relationship to coding just like there are people that come up and they're able to speak four or five languages because of their social circumstances, because their family. You got aunts and uncles from all over the place and they've all heard. So, the way they hear language is completely different than if you're trying to learn.

French has always been part of them, English has always been a part of them. They communicate in a way that we can't even get to. And these young people, coding and technology, that's exactly, that's the water that they swim in. So, the idea of somebody going, "Oh, you know what? I can't do that. Come on, boom, boom, boom, boom, boom." And they turn around and just for the bragging rights just to say, "Hey, man, I got this on my phone", to their mates. That is an incredibly powerful motivator, and that is also part of what we're going to be dealing with.

James Altucher: It's interesting. I haven't thought as much as maybe I should have about the dangers, because usually when people talk about the dangers, I think they go all science fiction on it, like we're going to create the Terminator and Robocop and all this other stuff. But you bring up the simple fact that hey, someone could just mimic somebody's mother's voice and say, be at this spot or wire this money over here today and whatever scams could happen. And I think that is probably a very serious and real danger. But I want to think about the music for a second, and this is where, and I might be wrong, but this is where AI is not going to compete with humans anytime soon. Think back to when you and your band were coming up with Cult of Personality, which stood the test of time decades later, everybody knows it and so on.

You were doing something new. There are a lot of ways you guys were doing something new. It was a new kind of metal, and you were saying something that was up-to-the-minute new for you, for everybody, which is why it was so important, this transition from having a cult of personality, having so much control over our lives to being aware of that's what this is, and we have to be nervous about it. Because I don't think that consciousness really existed that much beforehand. And I always wonder if humans are always going to come up with the new. AI is not going to come up with a Cult of Personality. It might come up with a better Drake, but it's not going to come up with Cult of Personality until you came up with it.

Vernon Reid: Well, that's the thing about the limits of this conversation about AI. It's actually we still have to push the button. We still have to enter the prompt. It's sitting there and it needs us to interact with it. That's the difference. If I get a phone call from a chatbot and it wants to talk to me, then we've got another situation, then we got something else is happening. We discount being in our bodies. We think of our brains as it's like a brain in a jar or something. We also, even if you're talking about Stephen Hawking, he transcended his circumstances. Know what I mean? It's a very strange thing. The thing about as the models or the AIs become more sophisticated, they're going to also become more manipulative, because they need us. Every time we interact, that's the other thing too, the large language models, every time we interact with it, we are also training it.

And that's the other part of it. Every time we put in a prompt, every time, if you write a story, I asked a Chat GPT 4, "Who owns this story?" Then Chat said, "You do." Really? It's like, "You do." It's like, "Everything that you do with me is yours." And I'm like, wow, how generous, because you need me to interact with you to train you. So, it's like if I want to write a brand new Sherlock Holmes thing, whatever, you're cool with it because you need me to interact with you. And we're finding out the model for the businesses is the subscription models.

You could interact with Chat GPT 4 for free, but you're going to have to be on the line. If you want to deal with it when you want to, you pay a subscription. The same deal is happening now. And I went down this rabbit hole of looking at natural speaking voice emulation of voice cloning. And some of them are, they still sound very robotic. They're not really that good. There are a few that are pretty interesting, but the one that's collect, I'm not saying names here, but the one that's connected with Lucasfilm, if you want to do that, the voice cloning, you're going to have to pay \$2,000 a year, the subscription for that. So, it's also, again, you could get a natural sounding voice, computer voice or pay \$300 a year. And then it's a certain level. If you want to do something that's going to fool anyone, and there's no artifacts. There are no artifacts. It sounds like a person speaking, you're going to have to pay for that.

James Altucher:

Well, now.

Vernon Reid:

Now you are.

James Altucher:

All those things. Yeah, price goes down on every technology ultimately.

Vernon Reid:

There you go.

James Altucher:

So, you're going to get it for free sooner or later. I mean, a mobile phone was \$12,000 in the 80s, and now it's less. I wonder with voices if it's going to ultimately, at first I was looking into the voice thing as well, and I was wondering if it would have this so-called uncanny valley phenomenon. So, in virtual reality, the virtual reality seems so real, but something in you feel after 45 minutes or so, your stomach gets upset because your brain realizes this is not real, even if you want to believe it's real. I wonder if voices will produce the same effect that, oh, if I talk to a ... let's say I don't want to do an audiobook, but the publisher says you have to do an audiobook, and so I use an AI voice instead. I'm concerned people about halfway through will feel repulsion in part because of my writing, but in part because the voice doesn't sound, something in their brain realizes this is not a human voice.

Vernon Reid:

That's the problem.

James Altucher:

And I wonder-

Vernon Reid:

Right, you need-

James Altucher:

I wonder if that will happen.

Vernon Reid:

Well, yeah, because I think so, because performance, emotive performance in real time, it's in real time. It's in real time. I mean, it takes a lot more, it's kind of like this idea now that we have a supercomputer that could beat a human being in chess. Part of the thing that's very dangerous, there are two things. There's the, it's good enough where we accept things because it's good enough. And the other problem is the why bother. And the why bother is an aspect like you hear that there's a computer that beat Kasparov and is one of the greatest chess masters in the world.

And the problem is if you descend into why bother. So, why bother? And that's not the point. That's really not the point of playing chess against a human opponent. That's not the point. There's something about being able to think three and four ... chess is not limited to the game in front of you. It's about ways of thinking and organizing your own mind and how you figure out problems. That's the value of chess and gaming on another level where you interact with the rules because how many billions did it take for there to be a computer to beat Kasparov?

James Altucher:

It's true. I should mention, I slightly in graduate school helped work on that computer before it was bought by IBM and IBM had offered me a job and I didn't take it, but I've spoken to Garry Kasparov about that match, and I was in the playing hall in 1997 when that match happened. And it was a very existential question for chess. Does chess continue now that it can ... and it's still an existential question because there's the cheating issue.

Like anybody who has their smartphone in the bathroom between moves in a game in a real tournament with money at stake, can cheat. So, there's a lot of, anti-cheating is a huge subject in the chess world, and there's no real answer. What happens when the computer's in our brain and you can't stop it, but to your point, there is something very human and enjoyable about playing the game. Or to go back to the Amy Winehouse example, when she's singing, there's gazillions of neurons in her head pattern recognizing with all of her traumatic experiences that are coming into the performance. Can AI ever replicate that, particularly on the frontier of music?

Vernon Reid: When Rehab came out, I jumped out of my chair because that one sentence, "They tried to make me go to rehab. I said, no, no, no." That was so human. It was so honest. It was so honest that it was shocking because very rarely do you get that kind of raw, basic honesty. And unfortunately for Amy, that struggle was very real. That struggle ultimately cost her her life. She really was fighting it. She really was fighting it. She was in the grip of a problem. And that's the power of that no, no, no. It was real, real, real. And I don't know that AI gets to that.

James Altucher: But let me ask you this though, because then it also addresses the question, what do people actually want? So, you love Rehab. I love Rehab, but a lot of people like the latest pop song, and I remember it was about seven or eight years ago, this book came out, the Hit Factory about a bunch of producers in Sweden that basically figured out what is the formula to make a hit. And so now they produce all the songs that are regularly in the top 10 from all these pop music stars, and that's what people like. It's just this formulaic pop album that wasn't created by an AI, but the formula was deconstructed and reproduced by these producers. And so they just keep churning out hit after hit, doesn't even matter who the singer is because they can autotune the voice. And music has already changed.

Vernon Reid: But that's primarily a kind of pop that's very, it's a pop that's very shallow and it leaves a lot of life stuff out and that works. And shallowness, we have to be honest, shallowness has a huge constituency. People that don't want to think too deep, people that don't want to feel all that deeply, they don't want to hear about their own personal mortality. They don't want to hear about certain things, and those people are going to be ... And even love relationships or again, it's not about sacrifice, it gets to a certain place, but that's not going to imitate a Bonnie Raitt.

And it might be a generational thing, but when I think about artists that really speak to the people, they're not just on the surface level, but really speak to what's going on. I think about her and her, she had attracted, everything's not okay. Basically there are people who are actually artists who actually touch on something like a Frank Ocean, like a her, a modern art that actually touch on things. And there's an audience for that. But these people you're talking about, that's not what they're talking about that. That's not what they do. They do things that appeal, and the appeal is a shallow appeal. And that's cool. You could have a formula for that.

James Altucher: Right. But I'm wondering if AI is just always going to be in that category. So, for instance, I'm curious about this data. So, in the year it came out, Cult of Personality was a top 10 billboard song. I wonder how many top 10 billboard songs in the past 10 years now are not what Cult of Personality was, but what this other thing is, which is just some formula that's reconstructed with a new voice and a slightly different chords and new lyrics, but are formulaic. I wonder how much of the top 10, and this is related to money, because Top 10 makes more money. I wonder how many top 10 songs are just formulaic as opposed to something that put ... Amy Winehouse was top 10, but she pushed the edge, and now what percentage of top 10 songs are formulaic versus pushing the edge? And AI might just help that side, but then it can't push the edge, because it's not going to have those rehab experiences.

Vernon Reid: Right. Well, again, we're going to be the arbiters in terms of being producers or collaborators, collaborating with AI. The thing about collaborating with a language model, if you don't like something, you just regenerate. You just regenerate. You just regenerate. It has no ego. It's not going to get ... You know what? At a certain point, if we get snarky AI, we really got to be worried. We start to get sarcastic AI, because you can actually program, well, you know what? Maybe we don't want

just capitulation, maybe part of what we're going to train it to do is to push back against us or be snarky, whatever. And that's going to become again, and then the anthropomorphic process will kick into another gear at that point when it's being sarcastic with us when we get up in the morning and then become your friend that tells you off. There's a whole other level of where this can go.

Not just the HAL 9000 that agrees with you, the HAL 9000 that's not going to lock you out of the airlock. And this is the thing about the relation, we're going to form weird, strange relationships with these technologies as they evolve. It's really not artificial intelligence that we should be concerned about. We should be concerned about artificial personality. That's what we need to be concerned about.

James Altucher: Concerned about, but then here's an idea. So, I agree that's scary. You're bringing up a lot of scary things that I hadn't thought about, but there's also a hybrid aspect to it. You mentioned the photographer who won the contest for black and white photography, but then of course didn't take the prize. Then he described his process of coming up with prompts. What if I'm interested in photography, but I don't have any skill at it, but I would love to make photographs, but I also don't know anything about camera lenses. What if he could put together his promptographer set of prompts?

Here's this guy's prompts 2023, and I could buy them from him. What if I could go to Vernon Reid and I don't know anything about music production, but maybe I'm pretty good with lyrics or something and I want to buy your prompts. I'll be never good enough at music, and my music understanding won't be deep enough to come up with the prompts you can come up with. So, I need to buy your prompts in order to produce good music. Then there might be some interesting hybrid things going on here.

Vernon Reid: Absolutely. I think the art of the prompt is going to be another revenue stream. It's going to become a tool in the "influencer toolkit", like this prompt to be a promptographer, it's a brand new thing. It's a brand new thing. There are places where this could go in terms of design, in terms of capturing certain things. There are unexpected new opportunities. I don't mean to say, it's not just negative. The problem, again, the problem and the solution always comes back to people. What we're willing to do, how we think about things, our willingness to turn something 45 degrees and look at it from a different angle. It's like you brought up the Terminator. One of the things I thought about, well, if Skynet doesn't want Sarah Connor to have John Connor, why send a robot to kill her? Send her Brad Pitt. Send Sarah Connor the perfect boyfriend that strings her along.

James Altucher: Oh, that's great. That's the ultimate weapon.

Vernon Reid: Right? The whole idea is have them sending a robot to kill up everybody. If you want to do your work, that's more about our addiction to spectacular violence. But if you're talking about being efficient, don't send her a killer. Send her a lover. Send her a song, man, that someone that knows Sarah Conner more than she even knows herself.

James Altucher: But see, that's creative. So, there's going to be some prompt engineer in the 24th century who says, oh no, let's make the prompt for a lover rather than a Terminator and send that back instead. So, it seems like there's always a human component of this, which is that we're the ones feeding in. We're the ones with the queries. We're the ones with the questions and the prompts. And the more I look into this and see different prompts, it really gets layers and layers of sophistication. Like when you were constructing the Bob Dylan song before, I could say, give me a Bob Dylan song from this period to this period.

But then you know what? Look at all the critics reviews and just give me a song that the critics would love and then throw in Mick Jagger style lyrics as well for the refrain or I don't know. And now suddenly I've got Vernon Reid's, I could buy his set of Bob Dylan prompts for Bob Dylan music that's going to be much better than anybody else just writing, "Please write me a Bob Dylan song." You'll

have better prompts for making a good musical Bob Dylan song.

Vernon Reid: It's going to be interesting. One of the things about, again, the Terminator construct is that it's a single company, and it's naive. The thing is, we already have 3, 4, 5, 10 companies. The thing is going to be competition. There's going to be competition in terms of how the AIs interact with us, how useful they are. That's the other part of it. I'm surprised, Apple's silence is very telling. All these other companies are talking about it. Apple has remained silent, and that doesn't mean they're not thinking about this. So, I'm wondering how does, and especially because Siri was the first one to come out and actually was incredibly ineffectual in its own way, incredibly limited.

So, now OpenAI makes Siri laughable. So, what's the next Siri going to be about? Because they're not going to stand pat. They're going to come up with something. And so part of what we're dealing with is also competition on many levels between companies inside of the social media framework, inside of the influencer framework. The competition is not going to diminish. It's going to accelerate. And that's going to add to the speed of the development of these language modelings and the modelers and the artificial intelligence evolution is going to, as fast as it's been, it's going to accelerate. And that's part of the thing that everybody's like, all the older researchers that look as they're nervous about what's going to happen, and again, Pandora's Box has been blown up. We blew up Pandora's Box.

James Altucher: And we have no idea what will happen. Right now, again, it's in the popular imagination because it's become social, because it's Chat GPT. It's not just AI, this generic thing. But what if insurance companies say, "Hey, we think you're a safer risk, we're going to lower all your insurance costs. Just give us access to your email. We're going to use our AI to look at your email and we'll determine if you deserve lower costs or not." And so for grandma and grandpa, they have very simple lifestyles, but they're a certain age. So, maybe the insurance company lowers the rates a little bit. But what if you have a household, your teenage daughter starts typing in her emails, "Hey, let's go party and blah, blah, blah." And now suddenly your insurance rates go up and you have no idea why.

Vernon Reid: Exactly.

James Altucher: And the insurance company's not allowed to tell you because of privacy issues.

Vernon Reid: And this is where the problem is. This for me is partly where the rubber hits the road, because there's also this kind of, not just the insurance companies, but law enforcement and this whole idea of using language modeling or AIs to deal with predictive crime or to deal with what happens in terms of parole is very disturbing because people are being singled out and they're not being told why they're being singled out. But see, I say to that, if law enforcement is going to use these tools, then citizens should have a right. The AI should be able to look at any cop's record. And disciplinary records, they should be assessed by AI as well.

And we have to demand that if you're going to use these tools against us, then we need tools to protect us from you. Absolutely. It's the who watches the watcher thing. And I'm telling you, a lot of statistics about shootings and about cops that hadn't been written up about stuff, those things have been held away from public view. And this to me is a very important thing in terms of civil liberties. If these models are going to be targeted at the populace, then the cops, they should not be above scrutiny themselves.

James Altucher: It's almost like maybe that's a good style of regulation. If you're using a tool against us, now we suddenly have the right to use that tool against you. So, in the insurance case example, if you're going to raise my rates, the other members of my family have to sign away their privacy and I need to know why you're raising my rates, privacy, whatever. And I need to know the algorithm, the specific reasons why you're making these decisions.

Vernon Reid: Exactly.

- James Altucher:** So, maybe everything has to be two-way. Because that's something you could regulate, but it's complicated though. You're right. And whatever problem we come up with, it gets more complicated.
- Vernon Reid:** This is where legislation has a place, a word to say about regulation. This is something that it can't just be left one-sided. It cannot be left one-sided.
- James Altucher:** Yeah. Because if you think about it, there's ever since 9/11, and of course decades before that, there's always issues about racial profiling, particularly when it comes to law and order. But now if the AI is doing the profiling and it's behind this million layer neural networks, so you don't know exactly why someone's being profiled. It's almost a way to keep it all hidden why someone's being pulled out.
- Vernon Reid:** Exactly.
- James Altucher:** So, that gets very interesting and complicated as well, because the AI might not be even able to explain why they pulled someone out. There could be millions of inputs.
- Vernon Reid:** Well, the algorithm was written by people, I mean, they were written by people and now they're running ... This is the other thing that's very disturbing for the people that even work with these large language modelers. They're saying that these entities, they're having internal conversations, they're doing things while they're running on their own. I mean, we're adjusting certain things, but a lot of the inputs not coming from us. It's getting it from the dataset, and we're not sure how the interrelations in the dataset are even happening.
- James Altucher:** Right. Because as you mentioned, every use of Chat GPT makes Chat GPT a different Chat GPT. It takes this, oh, this human liked this response but didn't like this response. Now its entire set of responses around the world has just changed, and that happens every second all over the world at this moment. And it's interesting, you bring up chess as an example. Ever since that match, chess computers of course have been getting better and better, and now a chess computer is to the world chess champion what the world chess champion might be to an average player. That's how much better chess computers are. Garry Kasparov almost had a chance in 1997, but now he would lose a hundred out of a hundred games. But what's happened is the chess computers now play strategies and moves that are so human, they're beyond what any human has already ... like humans, the world champion studies the computer's games to get better.
- Vernon Reid:** It's wild.
- James Altucher:** Because the computers are playing moves that were never thought good before, it turns out they're actually good.
- Vernon Reid:** Yeah. Well, that's what happened when it beat the Gold Master is that at a certain point it made a move and the people were saying, what? It just made a move that was completely illogical. And then they realized that that was the move that had the player win the game. Now, take what we're saying in a game situation. Imagine we unleash a modeler on the markets in terms of investing. We already have algorithms running micro trades. So, if we throw in a Chat GPT, but a Chat GPT that its entire focus is financial markets and its entire focus is responding to super fast micro trading, where does that go? Because that's going to become a use case. That's going to become definitely a use case. It's going to be like, well, you know what? It's micro trading. I have gotten no shot. What if I had you trade penny stocks for me? Number one, would the SEC allow it? And then how does that change the nature of markets and investing? Because that is a use case that's right there in front of us. It's right there.
- James Altucher:** And I bet that is already being done, because Chat GPT is taking trillions of pages of text or billions of pages of text, but all the trading that's happened since 1945 is finite. There's not a trillion trades. There's patterns that these supercomputers have already been working on for decades. So, I remember a few years ago, I read an article that I forget whether it was 2019 or 2018, every single day that year Goldman Sachs trading arm was profitable. How are you profitable every single day of

the year? They're already using some kind of investing GPT model somehow. They've already done it and we just don't know completely.

Vernon Reid:

Or it's like Madoff where it's a gigantic pyramid scheme where it's just like you're just bringing money in and sending money out, and you just need, the only way it works is that you have to get more and more institutional money, and then when you pay off the smaller investors, the mere millionaires, they're raving about you. They get other people in. That's how it worked. And I mean, Madoff's plan was to die and leave it for his sons to figure out. That's what Madoff's plan was. He was going to keep it going, and then he was going to exit stage left and whatever was left, that was going to be his family's going to deal with it. And then the crash, the financial situation happened in 2008, and then suddenly people wanted their ... It was all well and good. Everybody's getting 10% at all times. It was impossible.

And there was one person who said something, "You can't get 10% like that. You can't get it. There's no downturn?" And nobody listened to them because they were in the fervor. They were in the fever of getting these returns. So, nobody listened to this guy. He said, "That guy's doing something strange." So, then it went on and went on, and then there was a sudden a correction in the market or went down. Then people get nervous because we're irrational. We want the money to go under the mattress, and then suddenly it collapsed. If it wasn't for the financial crisis of 2008, he would've kept doing it. He would've kept doing it.

And so now that we've thrown in the idea of the artificial investor, you know what I mean? Well, I mean, could a pyramid be designed by the AI that's undetectable and we suddenly wind up in a whole other situation? Or are you able to design a pyramid that goes, okay, that's enough. Come back and pull it back. Because that's the thing is that human beings, it's never enough for us. Whenever people, they say, yo, I'm working at the bank and I take two pennies from everybody's account, eventually there's somebody that looks at their accounts and says, wait a minute, I'm always missing two pennies.

And that person gets caught because they can't stop. They say, "I'm smarter. I've got it going on. I'm raking it in. I'm just taking two." They rationalize it, and so they keep doing it and they don't go like, "Okay, you know what I want, my goal is to make, I'm going to make a quarter million dollars in pennies. That's how I'm going to do it, and then I'm out." People don't do that. They keep going. They keep going. And that's the irrationalism that is part of the makeup of the human condition.

James Altucher:

I think what will happen though is in a situation like this is that it'll be sort of a battle of AIs because the Goldman Sachs AI is going to try to beat out the Morgan Stanley AI is going to try to beat out the AI of the kid in the garage and just in the insurance company example, insurance companies are going to figure out how to use AI to make certain rates cheaper, and which customer base will handle more expensive rates if they're considered risks. So, there's going to be just nonstop layers of competing AIs on that stuff.

Vernon Reid:

Again, it's going to enter into a kind of occult space, if you will. Just like the AIs that hallucinate and we don't know why they hallucinate. We are entering into a space with competing AIs, doing who knows what, because we don't really know how it's thinking. Unintended, unexplainable things are going to happen. It's going to be very entertaining. I would say that it's going to be very entertaining except for the screaming and the gnashing of teeth.

James Altucher:

Well, let me ask this as a final question. What are you optimistic about in all of this?

Vernon Reid:

I'm really optimistic about the kind of collaborations that are not completely dependent on the large language modeling. It's going to be, to me, what I'm interested in, I've had some interesting little story things with Chat GPT 4, and it's funny when you see a line and you go, man, I didn't think about that. That's cool because a lot of it ... I mean, Arthur C. Clarke, "Any sufficiently advanced technology's indistinguishable from magic." Well, it's funny. I actually had a prompt for something and I used

an earlier version, and when you go to OpenAI, you can work with the earlier version or the latest version. You can work with 3 or 3.5 or 4. So, I came up with a prompt for 3.5, and I looked at it, I liked it, and I went and said, "Well, the more advanced one is going to be better, right?" But it was funny because I gave it the same prompt, and I found that I actually liked the earlier version more than I liked the more advanced version, which I didn't think was going to happen because it-

James Altucher: That is really interesting.

Vernon Reid: And I was surprised. Wow, I would've thought, of course, you're "better", but there was something, the earlier version got more to the point. It's like the more advanced version added more words, but it was clunky. And I thought that was so interesting that I liked something better from an earlier version. And then also I improved the prompt. I said, "You know what? Don't put my description in the output." Because I would read something and it would do something that was so on the nose, and I went, "No, no, no, don't do that." And it never got upset. It never argued. And so the moments when something wonderful and unexpected happens, just like with the imaging, and I'm very careful about that because the promptography and prompt illustration, again, it comes back to when I give a prompt and my prompts are weird.

It's like I'm going to describe something philosophical. Give me an illustration that's based on an existential prompt. At first, it's like, oh, that's whack. Wait a minute, that. And then I could turn that and go into and turn something ... I could combine the output with an actual photograph of mine that I took myself and create a collage that's conceptual, but it's also based on something real in the world that I shot. So, being imaginative, I am optimistic about where the combination of my imagination, but it's accessing different parts of my imagination, perhaps boosted by my interaction with this model. And that's the-

James Altucher: I think that is going to be interesting.

Vernon Reid: And that to me, it's actually really interesting for creative work and especially, it's like you have to be careful of, I find myself, when I look at the result, I go, well, would I say that? Or is the pivot really that cool? And it's just like working with something like my Helix, my Helix multi effects pedal that I can use this amp and I could use this distortion thing, but because it's not physical, I could put the delay before the distortion as opposed to after the distortion and get a sound that I hadn't anticipated. And that's where coloring outside the lines thinking like turning it 45 degrees, seeing it from a different angle, even pivoting from what I originally was thinking. I saw something that I wasn't even thinking about. That's where it can be very creative, and that's where it can be a lot of fun.

James Altucher: And I agree. I think there's going to be a whole new level of creativity that comes out of this, but you've also made me very aware of some of the problems we worried about. So, thank you for already increasing my nightmares and stresses. I appreciate it.

Vernon Reid: Well, again, this is our dystopia. We have begged for that. We have been begging, weirdly enough, and I don't know if it's the appetite for destruction. I don't know what that is, but there's something about this that feels like we are in a science fiction moment right now and that, as a science fiction fan, I'm horrified, but I'm also like, oh my God, this moment of uncertainty is really quite intriguing.

James Altucher: Yeah, it's interesting. We have been begging for a dystopia, whether it's cloning or AI or nuclear power, all of these things, we've been begging for them, and yet they're the subject of every dystopian science fiction novel out there right now.

Vernon Reid: It's amazing. Look out, there's going to be, I think the writer's strike, I think Chat GPT 4 has got to be a subject in the negotiations. The writers' going to be like, "You know what? Y'all use that. We are the writers we want to use it to spark our creativity. Great. But you can't use that to displace us."

James Altucher: It's a hard battle though. Because you just don't know. If I buy Stephen King's prompts to make a great horror novel-

- Vernon Reid:** But that's how they're catching students though. That's how they're using. They're using AI snipers to find out whether the term paper ... They have the students' earlier work to compare it against. Right? So, suddenly if the kid is suddenly, their sentence structure is wildly different, they say like, "You used an AI for this. Come on. Your earlier work for last year was nothing like this." So, it's like spy versus spy.
- James Altucher:** Yeah. Well, Vernon Reid, I'm such a huge fan. I'm so glad you came on the podcast and we had great discussion about AI. Come on anytime you want, if you have [inaudible 01:18:21]-
- Vernon Reid:** James, I really enjoyed [inaudible 01:18:22]-
- James Altucher:** Other stuff you want to talk about.
- Vernon Reid:** When we're all freaked out by Chat GPT 6 we've got to do this again.
- James Altucher:** Yeah, absolutely. Every version of Chat GPT. Well, Bernie's back again and scare us some more.
- Vernon Reid:** Oh my God. It baked a cake.
- James Altucher:** And it told us it tasted good, which would be scary. I have composed love letters to my wife using Chat GPT, so don't tell her that. She doesn't listen to the podcast.
- Vernon Reid:** Oh, I think it's out the bag now, bro.
- James Altucher:** We'll see.
- Vernon Reid:** I really enjoyed the convo, man.
- James Altucher:** Thank you, Vernon. Same here.



© 2023 Paradigm Press, LLC | 808 St. Paul St., Baltimore, MD 21202, United States of America
| [Privacy Policy](#) | [Terms and Conditions](#) | No part of this report may be reproduced or placed on any electronic medium without written permission from the publisher. Information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be reliable, but its accuracy cannot be guaranteed.

Paradigm Press allows the editors of publications to recommend securities that they own themselves. However, our policy prohibits editors from exiting a personal trade while the recommendation to subscribers is open. In no circumstance may an editor sell a security before our subscribers have a fair opportunity to exit. The length of time an editor must wait after subscribers have been advised to exit a play depends on the type of publication. All other employees and agents must wait 24 hours after on-line publication prior to following an initial recommendation. All other Paradigm Press employees and agents must wait 24 hours prior to following a recommendation. Signed articles represent the opinions of the authors and not necessarily those of the editors. Neither the publisher nor the editor is a registered investment adviser. Readers should carefully review investment prospectuses and should consult investment counsel before investing.