



laetus in praesens

Alternative view of segmented documents via Kairos

15 July 2024 | Draft

Facilitating Global Dialogue with AI?

Potential implications for international, interfaith, intercultural and interdisciplinary discourse

-- / --

Introduction

Questionable nature of "globality" in dialogue
AI Insights on global discourse from a Zen perspective
Challenging contrasts between AI perspectives
Contrasting Western perspectives on dialogue
AI validation of Chinese classical perspectives on dialogue?
Contrasting "ways of seeing" in global dialogue
Memorability of complementary learning cycles
Questionable futility of conventional global dialogue
Misrepresentation and misunderstanding of global unity and consensus
Implications of music for unity in diversity
Absence of exemplars of best practice in global dialogue
Multipolar versus unipolar dialogue and its implications
AI articulation of exemplary global dialogue?
Psychosocial critique of AI-enabled dialogue?
Recognition of the underworld of global dialogue
In quest of the deadly question for global dialogue

Introduction

The early web version of the program of the [Summit of the Summits](#) to be held in Hakone (Japan) in September 2024 invited critical commentary in an exercise appropriate to the times. Possible criteria for such commentary are identified in *Evaluating Synthesis Initiatives and their Sustaining Dialogues* (2000) and were submitted to two AIs in the form of [ChatGPT 4](#) and [Claude 3](#) (Opus variant) together with the web variant of the Summit program (*AI Commentary on an Envisaged Synthesis Dialogue*, 2024)..

That exercise followed earlier speculative experiments with the two AIs and presentation of their comments in response to a set of questions (*Eliciting a Pattern that Connects with AI?* 2024; *Experimental AI Meta-analysis of an Academic Journal Issue*, 2024). These highlighted various reservations with regard to the

process and the nature of the responses. As in what follows, little effort was made to challenge the responses in quest of more precise articulation -- an iterative engagement possible in future development of this approach.

With respect to the explicitly speculative framing of the questions presented to the AIs, it is somewhat surprising how proactively they respond to that possibility -- registering appropriate reservations -- in a period characterized by "*failure of imagination*". This is seen as consistent with a need for imaginative reflection on the crises of the times, as discussed separately (*Time for Provocative Mnemonic Aids to Systemic Connectivity?* 2018). Of potential relevance is the extent to which AI can enable dialogue of higher quality (*Use of ChatGPT to Clarify Possibility of Dialogue of Higher Quality*, 2023; *Higher Dimensional Reframing of Unity and Memorable Identity*, 2024; *Artificial Intelligence as an Aid to Thinking Otherwise -- but to what End?* 2023; *Second-order Dialogue and Higher Order Discourse for the Future*, 2023).

Coincidentally the Summit of the Summits in Japan is envisaged in the same period as that of the United Nations *Summit of the Future* in New York -- with the theme of *Our Common Agenda*, framed as the UN Secretary-General's vision for the future of global cooperation. At the time of writing it is unclear to what extent AI will be used to enhance the discourse of the UN Summit -- especially since it is explicitly associated with a UN policy brief on the *Global Principles for Information Integrity*. This offers a comprehensive framework to guide multistakeholder action for a healthier information ecosystem -- with of five key principles designed to strengthen information integrity. That initiative follows an earlier summit organized by a UN Specialized Agency -- *AI for Good Global Summit* (2023), in which it does not appear that any significant use was made of AI.

A major concern with respect to the conventional framing of summits is the degree of naivety with which they envisage declarations and resolutions as a satisfactory outcome -- despite considerable evidence that these are subsequently ignored, no matter how worthy they are deemed to be. In all probability this may be the fate of *Towards a Planetary Commons Approach for Environmental Governance* -- a policy brief for the UN Summit of the Future. Potentially more problematic is the total failure to devote resources to determining why global dialogue is vulnerable to such failure.

The following experiment is intended to complement the unimaginative, repressive approach of a technophobic international community, readily qualified in terms of fear-mongering. That is especially ironic given its rapid development as an aid to security services and military operations. Understood otherwise, it merits exploration as heralding a challenging new world order of interactive communication (*Forthcoming Major Revolution in Global Dialogue*, 2013).

The following experiment is inspired by themes characteristic of Japanese culture -- as evoked by the provisional summit program. This invites reference to Zen philosophy as characterized by the traditional set of 48 koans of the so-called *Gateless Gate* (*Mumonkan*). A case has been previously made for the value of appreciating the insights of "Eastern" articulations to complement those promoted so vigorously within the "Western" frameworks with which AI is so prominently associated (*Coherent Reconciliation of Eastern and Western Patterns of Logic*, 2023). A specific challenge is assumed to be that of the comprehension and memorability of complex frameworks -- hence the provocative evocation of 47 micronutrients as insightful metaphors (*Memorable Configuration of Psychosocial "Vitamins", "Amino acids" and "Minerals"*, 2024). The AIs in the following experiment engaged proactively and explicitly in the hypothetical confrontation of such micronutrients with the set of 48 koans -- and with possibilities for their memorable geometrical configuration as polyhedra.

Of further interest, and of some relevance to the preoccupations of the UN, the AIs were able to adapt that speculative exploration both to the set of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and that of the Inner Development Goals (IDGs). A particular merit of any Zen framing is the recognition of a degree of paradox and humour potentially inherent in articulations from which it is too readily assumed to be absent, as discussed separately (*Paradoxes of Durable Peace, Heaven and a Sustainable Lifestyle*, 2023; *Humour and Play-Fullness: essential integrative processes in governance, religion and transdisciplinarity*, 2005).

As in the previous experiments, the responses of ChatGPT are distinctively presented below in grayed areas, in parallel with those of Claude 3. **Given the length of the document to which the exchange gives rise, the form of presentation has itself been treated as an experiment** -- in anticipation of the future implication of AI into research documents. Web technology now enables the whole document to be held as a single "page" with only the "questions" to AI rendered immediately visible -- a facility developed in this case with the assistance of both ChatGPT and Claude 3.

This compact presentation facilitates readability and overview by reducing the apparent length of the complete document by over 90%. However readers have the ability to toggle access to the individual AI "response" associated with each question -- and to hide it. This interactive facility (available in the [original](#)) is not available in the PDF forms of the document -- for which both questions and responses are necessarily visible in a necessarily lengthy presentation.

As mentioned, reservations regarding this method of interaction with AI have been previously highlighted (*Eliciting a Pattern that Connects with AI?* 2024). These noted questionable styles of response readily characterized as "algorithmic enthusiasm" (or "synthetic appreciation"), together with presumptions of an anthropomorphized relationship by which the questioner is repeatedly flattered -- clearly to encourage engagement in the process as a marketing technique. Whilst these could be edited out, as a feature of the experiment they have not been removed; responses have been minimally edited for format alone. The approach allows readers to repeat the questions at a later stage or to other AIs -- possibly at a future time when their capacities have been further developed.

Show All AI Responses

Questionable nature of "globality" in dialogue

The widespread evocation of "global" in this period calls for particular comment in relation to its contrasting meanings and their significance for dialogue (*Future Generation through Global Conversation*, 1997). These have implications within references to any emerging [global brain](#), themselves readily confused with understandings of a [noosphere](#).

Question: In a period in which there is frequent reference to globalization, and how it is sustained by global conversation, there is a case for exploring the inadequacy of the implied understanding of "globality" in dialogue terms. The focus is typically on globality in a "geographical sense" reinforced by associations with the physical "globe". Much neglected is the "integrative sense" of globality which might be associated with transcendence of interfaith, interdisciplinary, interethnic and intergender preoccupations. The term also has implication for the "well-roundedness" of an individual or a perspective, with particular technical implications in mathematics. Could you comment on how the conflation of these various senses of globality hinders recognition of a need for more integrative forms of dialogue.

Show/Hide AI response

AI Insights on global discourse from a Zen perspective

The AIs were previously challenged to provide adaptations of the complete set of 48 Zen koans and their potential correspondence to 47 micronutrients understood in psychosocial terms (*Insightful implications of Zen koans*, 2024; *Potential correspondence with micronutrients essential to life*, 2024)

Question: In a previous phase of this exchange you were able to generate speculatively adaptations of the 48 koans of the *Mumonkoan* (*The Gateless Gate*). Irrespective of that exercise, could you generate a distinctive articulation adapting the insights (metaphorically) to collective dialogue. The question is therefore whether such an adaptation would highlight insights which tend to be neglected in collective dialogue aspiring to

integrative strategic understanding. Could you comment on the request before engaging in the exercise

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Make the adaptations of the koans as envisaged

Show/Hide AI response

Challenging contrasts between AI perspectives

As a feature of this experiment with AI responses, the following question to each AI used the previous response of each (above) which was then presented for comment to the other -- without any indication to that effect. This offers an insight of how AIs with contrasting forms of training might critically assess their output. The approach could be compared to any exercise in submitting the articulations of one global dialogue to another.

Question: In the light of that adaptation could you comment critically on the strengths and weaknesses of the following variant from another source

Show/Hide AI response

AI validation of Chinese classical perspectives on dialogue?

The 64 conditions identified in the Chinese classic, the *I Ching*, invite interpretation with relevance to dialogue (*Documents relating to Sustainable Dialogue*, 2006). This was used to evoke commentary from the AIs, as with a classical circular arrangement of those conditions (*Interrelationships between 64 Complementary Approaches to Dialogue*, 2007)

Question: You have usefully provided speculative interpretations of the relevance of the set of 48 koans to global dialogue. A similar exercise could be performed with respect to the 64 hexagram-defined conditions of the *I Ching* (attached). A particular merit of that encoding is that it proposes a specific articulation of the transformations between the 64 conditions. Those transformations can be represented diagrammatically in the classic Shao Yong circular arrangement (attached). Could you comment on the contrast with the Mumonkan framework

Show/Hide AI response

Contrasting Western perspectives on dialogue

Question: It is of course the case that the koans derive from a particular Eastern tradition -- to whatever extent they are widely appreciated. Given your assessment of both variants, could you comment on the relevance of the set of 48 insights to Western understandings of dialogue and the manner in which it is practiced, notably in global summits

Show/Hide AI response

Contrasting "ways of seeing" in global dialogue

Of particular value to the challenge of dialogue is recognition of the contrasting "ways of seeing" which may be exhibited and valued by participants (*Requisite variety of strategic "ways of looking"?* 2023; *Interrelating Multiple Ways of Looking at a Crisis*, 2021; *Ways of looking at ways of looking -- in a period of invasive surveillance*, 2014)

Question: Collective dialogue typically involves participants and stakeholders of varying expertise and of skills in dialogue. This tends to highlight the degree to which all involved are effectively located on

contrasting -- even complementary -- learning pathways. To the extent that these may reflect contrasting "ways of seeing" -- themselves complementary -- could you endeavour to cluster the koan-based insights accordingly

Show/Hide AI response

Memorability of complementary learning cycles

Of particular interest with respect to the process of global dialogue is whether learning cycles can be recognizable or enabled (*Cognitive Cycles Vital to Sustainable Self-Governance*, 2009; *Recognition of learning pathways and cycles towards sustainable synthesis*, 2024; *Metabolic pathways and cycles of psychosocial transformation?* 2024)

Question: Could you comment on the extent to which the insights so clustered effectively define the dynamics of complementary learning cycles which fruitful global summits implicitly aspire to interweave. How can that interweaving of the set of insights be rendered comprehensible and memorable -- given the constraints on human memory and especially collective memory

Show/Hide AI response

Questionable futility of conventional global dialogue

Question: Reference is frequently made to the need for "dialogue" in the face of critically divisive global situations of which there are many examples. Little clarity is offered regarding the nature of such "dialogue". How might that understanding of dialogue contrast with your articulation and how is the frequency of dialogue failure then to be understood more fruitfully

Show/Hide AI response

Misrepresentation and misunderstanding of global unity and consensus

The quest for unity through dialogue calls for careful consideration -- given tendencies to oversimplification justified by questionable assumptions (*Engaging with Elusive Connectivity and Coherence: global comprehension as a mistaken quest for closure*, 2018; *Higher Dimensional Reframing of Unity and Memorable Identity: unification and integration framed coherently otherwise*, 2024)

Question: A characteristic framing of global dialogue focuses optimistically on achieving consensus ("getting to yes") -- at all cost -- and ensuring that stakeholders are "on the same page". Disagreement is framed as problematic and condemned. Much is simplistically assumed regarding the nature of "unity" and "speaking with one voice". As these processes are typically comprehended, how do they obscure and inhibit comprehension of the subtlety of the "unity in diversity" exemplified by viable ecosystems -- as music is capable of highlighting

Show/Hide AI response

Implications of music for unity in diversity

Question: Could you comment on the curious "cognitive disconnect" between the appreciation of the complexities of harmony and dissonance in music (as deliberately presented as a form of celebration on the occasion of global summits) and the patterns of discourse in practice at the summit. How might it be expected that the complex organization of the music and its many "voices" would "translate" into the policies and strategies articulated at the summit.

Show/Hide AI response

Global dialogue and summitry may be framed as a "dance" -- and dance as dialogue (Line Brandt, *Dance as Dialogue: metaphorical conceptualization and semantic domains*, *Signata: Annals of Semiotics*, 6, 2015). The meme has been adapted to sustainability (Kevin Moss, *Learning the Steps to the Sustainability Dance*, *GreenBiz*, 14 May 2010).

Question: Allusions are made through myth to a time of "giants" in the distant past. The term is applied to certain corporations and countries central to global dialogue -- in contrast to any explicit mention of the "pygmies" present in such contexts. A striking use of the meme has been made by Rosabeth Moss Kanter (*When Giants Learn to Dance*, 1990) -- as the definitive guide to corporate success. Global dialogue lends itself to characterization as a "dance" from a meta-perspective. Could you comment on the evident difficulties of collective giants in "learning to dance" -- potentially as characteristic of a more fruitful future time

Show/Hide AI response

Absence of exemplars of best practice in global dialogue

Given the many domains in which excellence is highlighted as providing exemplars worthy of emulation, it is somewhat extraordinary to note how rare is the reference to excellence in dialogue (*Meta-communication as characterizing exemplary dialogue?* 2023). Of particular interest is the possibility that engagement with AIs may engender recognition of dialogue of a "higher order" (*Second-order Dialogue and Higher Order Discourse for the Future*, 2023; *Use of ChatGPT to Clarify Possibility of Dialogue of Higher Quality*, 2023; *Artificial Intelligence as an Aid to Thinking Otherwise -- but to what End?* 2023).

Question: Your response notes many possibilities which are susceptible to implementation in many dialogue contexts. Could you comment on the apparent lack of instances in which "best practice" in collective dialogue is demonstrated as an inspiration for others -- whereas unfruitful dynamics may well be the focus of TV coverage, as in panel sessions and legislative assemblies. This would seem to contrast with the promotion and appreciation of excellence evident in the case of musical groups and choirs

Show/Hide AI response

Question: The response suggests the possibility of reframing in the light of the problematic roles of "soloists" in dialogue and in music. In dialogue considerable emphasis tends to be placed on "winning" as in debate. Musical performances have long recognized the challenging dynamics associated with "prima donnas" -- potentially incorporated fruitfully in opera. This contrasts with the dynamics of international, interfaith, and interdisciplinary dialogues for which no such framing has emerged. "Gurus" of contrasting persuasion do not seem to engage together in any form of "opera" transcending their particular perspective -- other than through processes readily framed as virtue signalling and tokenism

Show/Hide AI response

Multipolar versus unipolar dialogue and its implications

Question: The response has implications for the articulation of a "multipolar" world order in contrast with a deep commitment to "unipolar" hegemony in which "there can be only one" (as explored in the iconic drama of *The Highlander* movie). Given the worldwide appreciation of music, how might the skills in its presentation and embodiment be "translated" into the organizational and strategic domains -- given the identity they are held to embody

Show/Hide AI response

The world has been confronted by the assertion by President Macron of France that NATO is "brain dead" (*Emmanuel Macron warns Europe: NATO is becoming brain-dead*. *The Economist*, 7 November 2019; *NATO is suffering 'brain death', argues French president Macron*, *France24*, 7 November 2019; *Is NATO really suffering 'brain death' as French president Emmanuel Macron? claims?* *France24*, 8 November 2019). This

perception invited a more general question (*Are the UN and the International Community both Brain Dead*, 2019).

Such concerns are currently all the more relevant in a period in which there is widespread preoccupation with the cognitive capacity of the President of the United States -- frequently acclaimed as the [leader of the free world](#), and therefore a key participant in any global dialogue (*80% of voters concerned about Biden's cognitive health*, *News Nation*, 8 July 2024; *What Is a Cognitive Test? A Look at Mental Fitness Exams for Presidents*, *US News and World Report*, 12 July 2024).

Question: In a period in which there is widespread concern at the evidently declining cognitive capacities of the titular head of NATO, self-acclaimed as "[running the world](#)", could you comment on the degree to which the international community can itself be held to be "brain dead". What does this imply for the quality of "leadership" vigorously promoted within the international community. Is global dialogue then especially vulnerable to the consequences of the Peter Principle -- whereby people are effectively promoted to their respective level of incompetence.

Show/Hide AI response

Question: The vulnerabilities to failure of global dialogue merit exploration as symptomatic of civilizational decline prior to eventual collapse -- with cognitive decline as a feature of an ageing knowledge-based civilization and its leadership. In that light how might AI take on a role comparable to palliative care -- possibly to be understood as a "cognitive prosthetic".

Show/Hide AI response

AI articulation of exemplary global dialogue?

Given the continuing qualification of exceptional environments as offering a "magical" experience, there is a case for challenging AIs to articulate potential examples of "magical dialogue" as might feature in contrasting approaches to global dialogue in the future (*Magical Discourse Contrasting Human and AI Identity*, 2023). Could AIs catalyze "magical discourse" in contrast to the prevalence of unfruitful binary discourse (*Magical discourse as contrasted with binary discourse*, 2023)

Question: In the light of the predicted rapid development of AI, its ability to generate engaging "stories", and the insightful arguments above, could you provide a speculative example of dialogue embodying the principles, dynamics, and variety of roles to which reference has been made -- as a means of indicating a form of global dialogue which would be qualified as "magical" thereafter.

Show/Hide AI response

Question: The challenge posed by the response is that it could be understood as reflecting a familiar degree of unrealistic idealism -- notably with the regard to the role of any facilitator or conductor and their acceptability. This could evoke criticism as being dangerously unrealistic and an approach variously undertaken with limited success. From a dramatic perspective it could be challenged as lacking the drama, risk and problematic dimensions of dialogue appreciated as "real". The difficulty is framed by the challenge to the role of any facilitator or conductor -- too readily assumed to be part of the "solution" without in any way being part of the "problem" in any global dialogue. This would presumably also hold for any AI facilitation

Show/Hide AI response

Given their implications for global dialogue, many efforts have been made to emulate the integrative significance of the archetypal Round Table of Arthurian legend (*Clarifying the Unexplored Dynamics of 12-fold Round tables*, 2019). That imagined for *Castalia* is one such (*Evoking Castalia as Envisaged, Entoned and Embodied*, 2016)

Question: In the quest for archetypes articulating the potential of global dialogue, that of *The Glass Bead*

Game played in Castalia is suggestive, if necessarily allusive -- as with the Game Players of Zan. Could you contrast such speculative articulations with the reality of the Davos Forum, the Bilderberg encounters, and those of the Club of Rome -- in the light of continuing commitment of the United Nations to global summits and the potential role in enabling them

Show/Hide AI response

Question: A major difficulty for any speculative indication of a fruitful global dialogue -- whether enabled by AI or otherwise -- is the tendency to focus on the principles of its organization rather than exemplifying their embodiment in practice inviting a degree of emulation. Missing is the avoidance of the "cut and thrust" of dialogue recognized as authentic rather than a somewhat futile simulacrum promoting "feel good" virtue signalling.

Show/Hide AI response

Question: The response could be understood as framing the constraints cultivated by extremes -- potentially suggested by the "harmony" implied by the [Anthem of Europe](#) and the chaotic popular appeal of the [Eurovision Song Contest](#). Neither has proven to be an inspiration for global dialogue. The response avoids any indication of an AI-enabled equivalent to "minute writing" to record and map the dynamics of the dialogue, the positions taken and abandoned, the circularity of argument, and the viability and sustainability of any agreement capable of incorporating disagreement. How is the dialogue to be comprehended and rendered memorable with the aid of AI -- given its proven ability to generate song ([A Singable Earth Charter, EU Constitution or Global Ethic?](#) 2006)

Show/Hide AI response

Psychosocial critique of AI-enabled dialogue?

Question: Could you comment on how the dialogue, and any reporting of it, would be reviewed from a psychosocial perspective. This might be framed by understandings of mythical drama ("wars of the gods?"), sexual connotations of principal roles ("[The Handmaid's Tale](#)"?), "games people play", and otherwise. For a global dialogue to be appreciated as "magical", to what extent is it expected to engage the wider population in such connotations. What makes for an endearing intrigue of global significance

Show/Hide AI response

Recognition of the underworld of global dialogue

Global dialogue is significantly impacted by a netherworld to which little attention is overtly accorded ([Systemic recognition of the "cognitive underworld" -- integrating the "netherworld"](#), 2020; [Cognitive embodiment of an "underworld" into governance](#), 2010). It can be variously explored ([Mysterious Complementarity between Capitalism and Arsenalism](#), 2020).

Question: The response avoids any reference to the mythical "underworld" -- exemplified by organized crime, conspiratorial cartels, and "deep state" agendas, and the secretive agendas of secret societies and cults. What precludes their integration into the global drama and understandings of global dialogue -- given the extent to which their role is widely inferred

Show/Hide AI response

How relevant to the function of global dialogue -- of which the World Economic Forum is upheld as an exemplar -- are reports of sexual dalliance (Peter Koenig, [WEF Davos: The New Sodom and Gomorrah?](#) *Global Research*, 19 January 2023; Shalini Ramachandran and Khadeeja Safdar, [Behind Davos, Claims of a Toxic Workplace](#), *The Wall Street Journal*, 29 June 2024). From a strategic perspective, that relationship invites further exploration ([Planetary Impalement by Stakeholder Capitalism? "Stake" as a strategic metaphor promoted by the World Economic Forum](#), 2023).

Question: Could you comment on the curious lack of overt acknowledgement of the manner in which global summits are treated as a major covert opportunity for sexual dalliance. From a cognitive perspective, should this be recognized as symbolic participant enactment in forms of intercourse in which they are unable to engage effectively and significantly in global discourse. What implications might this have for dimensions neglected in global dialogue.

Show/Hide AI response

In quest of the deadly question for global dialogue

Is there indeed a question that could shake humanity out of its dream state -- or is the dream state a form of impotence engendered by unconscious recognition of that question? Are deadly questions particularly characterized by being unasked, as separately discussed (*Strategic Implications of 12 Unasked Questions in Response to Disaster*, 2013)? Is there a catastrophic question whose avoidance is systemically dangerous for the future (*World Futures Conference as Catastrophic Question*, 2013)

The characteristics of a "deadly joke", or a "killer joke", have been highlighted by a comedy series in *Monty Python's Flying Circus* as the *Funniest Joke in the World*. This develops the concept of the "most deadly joke" -- a joke that is so funny that anyone who reads or hears it promptly **dies from laughter**. This speculatively suggests an "ultimately" transformative role of humour, as otherwise explored (*Humour and Play-Fullness: essential integrative processes in governance, religion and transdisciplinarity*, 2005). The "most deadly" framing is also to be found in relation to questions.

In its Annual Question of 2006, the Edge Foundation sought answers to the question *What is your most dangerous idea?* -- with responses compiled into a book (John Brockman, *What is Your Dangerous Idea? Today's Leading Thinkers on the Unthinkable*, 2007). Although a valuable indication, there is clearly a distinction to be made between a question understood as being **dangerous for "others"** (rather than oneself), one which is primarily **dangerous for "oneself"**, and one which is **dangerous for both**, and -- more fundamentally -- for any sense of their relationship.

Question: Could you comment on the evocation of a deadly question in global dialogue. Is there indeed a question that could shake humanity out of its dream state -- or is the dream state a form of impotence engendered by unconscious recognition of that question? Are deadly questions particularly characterized by being unasked. This relates to the characteristics of a speculative "deadly joke", or a "killer joke" -- a joke that is so funny that anyone who reads or hears it promptly **dies from laughter**. With respect to global dialogue, what might be held to be the most dangerous idea -- which the dynamics make every effort to skillfully avoid.

Show/Hide AI response

Humour may take a form framed as "deadly". As yet to be clarified is the role of humour in enabling future global dialogue (*Humour as a traditional key to memorable strategic insight*, 2024; *The Wit and Wisdom of the United Nations*, 1961)

Question: Whilst wit may be appreciated to a limited degree in global dialogue, the role of humour in fruitfully reframing its processes and innovative connectivity is accorded little consideration. This contrasts curiously with appreciation of court jesters in earlier variants of collective dialogue and the current relegation of humour to critical parody and cartoons outside the dialogue context -- if tolerated. Should parodies of global dialogues be deliberately envisaged to reflect implications "designed out" of dialogue organization -- acknowledging their "shadows"

Show/Hide AI response

Curiously a primary focus of global dialogue at this time is the **existential threat to humanity posed by AI** -- exemplified by the *EU AI Act: first regulation on artificial intelligence* (European Parliament, 8 June 2023). The concern is a primary feature in the UN's *Summit of the Future* (*UN Secretary General's Policy Brief on*

Information Integrity, International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, 22 June 2023). The institution most closely associated with warning of the existential risk of nuclear proliferation to humanity has seemingly reframed its focus onto the existential risk of AI (Jack Kelly, *Three key misconceptions in the debate about AI and existential risk*, *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 15 July 2024). This followed a reframing of a preceding crisis: *The pandemic revealed just how unprepared and unwilling countries and the international system are to handle global emergencies properly* (*Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 27 January 2021).

Faced with a multiplicity of problematic trends, there is little preoccupation with the potential role of AI in enabling [root cause analysis](#) and appropriate response to resistance to any appreciation of its conclusion (*Convergence of 30 Disabling Global Trends*, 2012; *Sustainable Development Goals through Self-reflexive Root Cause Analysis*, 2023). There is little trace of the potential role of AI in facilitating transcendence of the currently unproductive modes of global dialogue and governance -- exemplified by the outcomes of the UN's [AI for Good Global Summit](#) (2023).

Question: With respect to any exchange with AI regarding a "deadly question", there is great irony to the fact that AI itself is now deemed by much esteemed authorities to pose the most deadly challenge for humanity -- one enabling humanity's extinction. This then calls into question any potentially fruitful facilitation of global dialogue by AI -- a mode of dialogue currently assumed by authorities to be "fit for purpose", rather than instrumental in enabling the collapse of civilization. Is the deadly question that merits identification associated with fearful inability to explore the opportunities potentially highlighted by radical questions and root cause analysis.

Show/Hide AI response

Aspects of this argument, regarding use of polyhedra in configuring memorable integrative frameworks, are developed in separate documents: *AI-enabled Mapping and Animation of Learning Pathways* (2024); *AI Commentary on an Envisaged Synthesis Dialogue* (2024)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](#).

For further updates on this site, [subscribe here](#)