



Generated with AI, Felt by Human (Da Vinci & SyncOff, Out of Touch Space)

O . o ;x! Human Analytic !x; o. O

Cyber-Monkeys with AI Glasses

Introduction

I remember a story that my teacher Silvana, my elementary school teacher who I remember with love, one day told us.

I've always loved stories, but this story struck me particularly. I still call it back to my mind today, when, in facing new challenges, some points escape my understanding and asking for help seems to be a sign of weakness and ignorance when now I know, they are sign of great maturity, intelligence and strength.

The story is by Ivan Krylov and is entitled "The monkey and the glasses". Here a translation of the original story by Olga Dumer

*With time, old Monkey's eyes were getting poor;
One day, she heard that Glasses were the cure.
If it was true indeed what people said,
Then her predicament was not so bad!
She got the Glasses — half a dozen frames;
And tried them on in each and every way;
Applied them to her chest and tied them to her tail;
And smelled and licked them, pair after pair;
And all of it — to no avail.
«Damn it! — she cried — one who believes this drool,
Is nothing but a stupid fool:
It is just hogwash; not a word of truth;
They lied to me: the Glasses are no use!»
Frustrated and upset, old Monkey threw a fit
And smashed the Glasses on the wall so hard
They changed to piles of tiny sparkling bits.*

*Some human species, sadly, are the same:
A clueless boor would eagerly defame
A useful thing, regardless of its merit;
And if he happens to be born a magnate,
He'd use his power to persecute or ban it.*

It seems right to pay my first respects and thanks to the beautiful story of Ivan Krylov and the equally deserving translation of Olga Dumer, and to stop with all of you to observe and analyse it to grasp from it all the insights absolutely that we can derive from it.



Generated with AI, Felt by Human (Da Vinci & SyncOff, Out of Touch Space)

II Monkeyrisk

We will try to discover new aspects by looking at the history of Ivran from an **HumanAnalytic point of view and we will refer to our analysis parameter as Monkeyrisk.**

Monkeyrisk **can be** identified as an index of "moral's damage" itself.

Giallo o Rosso depending on the deviation of the "Monkey's thoughts" from reality and the impact that such a deviation has on society and on the well-being of the Monkey itself, as can be seen from the story of Ivran.

First level of Monkeyrisk

The first level of **Monkeyrisk** can be easily identified in the story. We could define this level of risk as "less dangerous" from the social point of view since we could find it even rational looking at the social model.

The focus point is to be identified in the sentence:

"And what a fool to listen to the rumours of humans: All that is said about glasses is a lie; are useless "

Drawing a parallel with the modern technological narrative, the risk of the adoption of Artificial Intelligence with part of society totally unprepared for it and not integrated in the ethical discourse that makes it up, highlights as an inadequate understanding, fed by an incomplete or incorrect "mouth to mouth", may lead to an improper use or total rejection of AI, placing to it the unjust label of "lie" or "useless", as we hear every day.

Human Analyst power: on!

Being HumanAnalyst, we can use behavioural psychology to look at our phenomenon and understand a sentence that otherwise might seem completely meaningless and without foundations:

Our poor Monkey buys glasses even though she doesn't know how to use them. In fact, he bought six pairs because " she heard that Glasses were the cure:

If it was true indeed what people said, then her predicament was not so bad!

With this invention, she too, a Monkey, could have seen better", an opportunity not to be **missed for a blind Monkey in a world where everyone else was seeing**. SHE WANTS TO BE PART OF THE GROUP of those who "see", of course.

The **sense of belonging** is something so strong for human beings, beautiful social animals, that feeling part **of a group pushes us** to buy six pairs of glasses not to be **excluded, even if** we have not even understood what these glasses are at heart.

And here falls..the Monkey!

The Monkey, without knowing how to use them, buys six pairs of glasses but in fact, without anyone driving it, **it is a less rich** monkey that remains such, submissive to the sighted man, and this he knows it, so I mean:

- take another pair, look they are right there, In fact, this new model I give you so maybe you even start to love me... -

*«Damn it! one who believes this drool,
Is nothing but a stupid fool:
It is just hogwash; not a word of truth;
They lied to me: the Glasses are no use!»*

In this case, our risk is **yellow**.

Technology is belittled, considered useless, not understood.

Comparing it to the scenario that we're experiencing, we can relate it to all those cases where AI is rejected because, as experts, we haven't been able to explain it and maybe really understand how to use it best.

The Monkey, in this case, is 'relatively harmless'; could become a beautiful flower or an ugly weed.

The cases in which this technology is rejected and deemed useless can be traced back to cases where, as Experts and as a Society, we have failed to integrate a part of the human painting in the product created for them too, a product that we now propose them to buy and Master, to feel part of the great picture that they have never seen or decided for.

We have not been able to reach people who simply speak another language and pay for it.

In this article, for now I like to leave this risk as a Schrödinger's box, to don't turn this text into a treaty and move together to the second level.

Second level of Monkeyrisk

The second level of Monkeyrisk is something more complex and unconscious, because it concerns an ignorance that goes deeper than ignorance resulting from lack of education.

Unfortunately, it is a lack or, to be precise, a **"long but reversible blindness of the inner eyes"**.

We have already seen this, in the biases of our faithful magnifying mirror, but we tried to break it with a stone.

In fact, we keep turning and turning our glasses because we don't like what we see and so we keep saying that we don't see anything or what they are showing is an hallucination.

In this case, behavioural neuroscience comes into play to help psychology.

The focus in this case must be moved to the sentence:

*“And smashed the Glasses on the wall so hard
They changed to piles of tiny sparkling bits.”*

The most serious risk: ego

Does Monkey know that so many men sing the praises of glasses and what does he do? He destroys them so that he does not have to recognize his ignorance with himself.

In this case the risk is red.

The Educated Monkey destroys the brilliant and useful creation that can improve her life because "wounded in the ego, she has no tools to manage such an intense emotion".

Always so closed in understanding her emotions and those of the men around her, to be able to handle all the attacks of external predators but not the most destructive, those that alone continues to launch since ever and that condemn Monkey in a world of Men.

It's such a paradox.

*Some human species, sadly, are the same:
A clueless boor would eagerly defame
A useful thing, regardless of its merit;
And if he happens to be born a magnate,
He'd use his power to persecute or ban it.*

The importance of opening the "inner boxes"

Here we cannot leave the box closed since leaving the box closed is another kind of danger.

Here the danger is to lose the chance to live our only life as a conscious life, free and worthy of being called by this name.

Plus, when this paradox can risk assuming such extensions as to involve and impact all future monkeys and baby-monkeys, it then begins to assume the dimension of danger of **human drama**.

At this point, leaving the boxes closed becomes **an act of cowardice** that we cannot afford if we truly love life.

We must open our "**inner boxes**" without fear and realize that now we must be more than ever **human, courageous, collaborative, and insanely creative**.

We can colour our monsters by now if they frighten us and make them dance under beautiful notes; represent them for what they are or discover them on the long journey of understanding them, **take care of them and ourselves**. And we can, precisely because of the combination of **us and the wonderful technology we have created**, if we do not refuse to start to do our part, making ourselves **ALL EQUALLY RESPONSIBLE**, since **WE are "THE SOCIETY"**; while and when we create something or when we take it in, while we stand by silently doing 'our thing' and benefit directly or indirectly from it, or when we just don't bother to protect **OUR WORLD** but only look for monsters or culprits in the end.

We can own the best technologies in commerce, power, money, and fame but if we are not able to **recognize ourselves or understand the dynamics that guide our actions**, behave like Cyber-Monkeys with AI glasses and calling ourselves Humans daily won't make us Humans.

Knowledge, collaboration and the desire to question ourselves, to learn, ask where we do not know and recognize when to stop and change approach, when we are not on the right path, are the only ways able to raise us from the level of technological monkeys to the one of Men and gain the human power to take the right decision in the right time for the best of ourselves and society at whole.



Generated with AI, Felt by Human (Da Vinci & SyncOff, Out of Touch Space)

19/05/2024, Out of Touch Space

Raffaella Russo

SyncOff

References

Olga Dumer 2018-2024, Russian Poems In Translations, @ add translation

Baumeister, R. F., & Pohlenz, A. L. (1996). The Banality of Denial: The Psychological

Dynamics of Denying Responsibility. *Personality and Social Psychology Review.

Ego-defense mechanisms and brief psychotherapies for the management of major depressive disorder in adults: A longitudinal and quasi-experimental study da Silva Machado a, Igor Soares Vieira a b, Carolina Scaini a, Mariane Lopez Molina a c, Luana Porto Barbosa a, Giovana Del Grande da Silva a, Liliane Ores d, Luciano Dias de Mattos Souza a, Karen Jansen a, Ricardo Azevedo da Silva a

Karpman, S. (1968). Fairy Tales and Script Drama Analysis. Transactional Analysis Bulletin.

Science Denial A Narrative Review and Recommendations for Future Research and Practice Kirsti M. Jylhä¹, Samantha K. Stanley², Maria Ojala³, and Edward J. R. Clarke⁴

Bhatt, M. A., Lohrenz, T., Camerer, C. F., & Montague, P. R. (2017). Neural dynamics

of interpersonal decision-making in the external world.

Grin, D., Oetzel, Daniel, & Zhang, J. (2020). Neuroscience based AI for human brain-computer interactions.

Kowalski, R. M., & Hanmer, T. J. (2000). Jealousy in response to perceived extradyadic interest: A test of the mediating mechanism. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships.

Miller, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2010). The case for using research on trait narcissism as a building block for understanding narcissistic personality disorder.

Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 1(3), 180-191.

Holtzman, N. S., Vazire, S., & Mehl, M. R. (2010). Sounds like a narcissist:
Behavioral manifestations of narcissism in everyday