SINGULARITY AND KAKISTOSCRYPTOCRACY

Srirath GOHWONG[1]
1 Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Faculty of Social Sciences, Kasetsart University, Thailand; srirath.g@ku.th

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received: 19 April 2024 **Revised:** 3 May 2024 **Published:** 17 May 2024

ABSTRACT
The goals of this study were to effectively address this knowledge gap by elaborating on how non-state actors used AI for personal gain under kakistoscryptocracy in singularity, potentially impacting state sovereignty, and to apply the market-ing of governmental power to lessen the negative impacts. Documentary research was used in the study. The findings revealed that the study comprehensively explored two relationships between kakistoscryptocracy and singularity: one concerning technological advancements and another regarding economic ones. According to these relationships, there are four critical issues as follows: unchecked use of AI for malicious purposes (technological singularity), widening wealth gap due to AI and automation (fracture scenario in economic singularity), unregulated technology facilitating illegal activities (collapse scenario in economic singularity), and control of blockchain by non-state actors (collective ownership and decentralization in economic singularity). Governments could use government power market-ing strategies to lessen these high risks.
Keywords: Singularity, Kakistoscryptocracy, Government Power Market-Ing

CITATION INFORMATION: Gohwong, S. (2024). Singularity and Kakistoscryptocracy. *Procedia of Multidisciplinary Research, 2*(5), 50.

INTRODUCTION

Singularity is not a new jargon. It has been employed in physics since at least 1922 when Albert Einstein published his widely known book “The Meaning of Relativity” based on his valuable lectures at Princeton University the previous year (Einstein, 1970). In his theory of general relativity, a singularity clearly describes a point where gravity becomes incredibly strong under extreme conditions. After that, it has since been adopted by various fields of study with different meanings. One prominent usage is in the concept of a technological singularity. This officially refers to a hypothetical future point where advancements in artificial intelligence obviously become uncontrollable and surpass human comprehension. This “runaway reaction” could be triggered by an intelligent machine's ability to self-improve at an accelerating rate, leading to the emergence of a superintelligence beyond human understanding and control. While the concept originated from conversations between mathematicians like John von Neumann and Stanislaw Ulam in the 1950s, it was later popularized by Vernor Vinge. Here are some examples of how the above-mentioned term is used across disciplines as follows: artificial intelligence as a potential of advanced AI without the uncontrollable aspects in a technological singularity (i.e. Ray Solomonof in 1985) and AI as a technological singularity (i.e. Luis Soares in 2023), Public Administration as an on-demand public service, not as a technological singularity (i.e. Nicole M. Rishel in 2011), monetary policy as a technological singularity (i.e. Vanorio in 2023), philosophy as a technological singularity (i.e. David Chalmers in 2016), statistics as a technological singularity (i.e. Irving John Good in 1966) (Particularly thanks to Chalmers, 2016; Einstein, 1970; Good, 1966; Rishel, 2011; Singla et al., 2023; Soares, 2023; Solomonoff, 1985; Vanorio, 2023; Ulam, 1958; von Neumann & Kurzweil, 2012). Moreover, it also adds another layer of complexity to the state management under kakistoscryptocracy. Coined by Srirath Gohwong in 2023, the term clearly describes the phenomenon that non-state actors (such as people, firms, and hedge funds) arbitrarily do their own activities (e.g., money laundering, fraudulence) beyond the state jurisdiction (Gohwong, 2023). There has been no prior study on the relationship between singularity and kakistoscryptocracy. **To effectively address this knowledge gap, the objectives of the study were to elaborate on how non-state actors used AI for personal gain under kakistoscryptocracy in singularity, potentially impacting state sovereignty, and to apply market-ing of governmental power to lessen the negative impacts.**

LITERATURE REVIEWS

Kakistoscryptocracy

Kakistoscryptocracy, coined by Srirath Gohwong in 2023, was a phenomenon where non-state actors (e.g. individuals, firms, and hedge funds) obviously played a vital role in three areas, spanning both the real and virtual worlds, through lots of IT tools (e.g. blockchain, AI, TOR, and the metaverse) as follows: government-controlled area, non-state actor-based area through underground websites (both deep and dark web), non-governmental cryptocurrencies (NGCs), and pirate firms, and net states area (run by a group of influential, international tech giants like Yandex, VKontakte, Kaspersky Lab, Microsoft, Tesla, Amazon, Apple, Facebook, and Google). They compromised sovereignty. These actors arbitrarily did their own illegal activities (e.g. money laundering), potentially using NGCs for personal gain. The solutions were tech ambassadors and corsairs (Gohwong, 2023a, 2023b).

Singularity

The concept of singularity was multifaceted by comprehensively investigating the potential future impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on diverse aspects of human lives. For example, these impacts could range from promoting good governance in politics to widespread job displacement due to automation and even widening the digital divide between the haves and the have-nots in society. Moreover, it highly affected ethics, including consciousness,

personhood, and even the nature of intelligence itself. Though the term could be popularly classified by many scholars into technological and economic singularities, it was widely associated with the technological one, in which AI exponentially exceeded human cognitive abilities. This could highly involve AI developing its own intelligence and goals with human-free input. As a consequence, humans inevitably became the second most intelligent beings on the planet. On the other hand, the economic singularity was another hypothesis that AI and machines performed all tasks efficiently that humans could do, but cheaper, smarter, and faster. This one focused on the societal and economic impacts of AI, especially the displacement of human labor and the need for new economic models and social contracts (Particularly thanks to Awret, 2016; Banafa, 2024; Blake, Shakespeare, Molloy, 2012; Chace, 2016, 2018; Chalmers, 2016; Chesi and Spiegel, 2020; Clark, 2003; Callaghan, Miller, Yampolskiy and Armstrong, 2017; Eden, Moor, Søraker, and Steinhart, 2012; Edmonds, 2021; Ferrando, 2019; Fukuyama, 2022; Goertzel and Goertzel, 2015; Geraci, 2010; Good, 1966; Hamilton and Lau, 2024;.Harbinja, 2023; Jalšenjak, 2020; Kneese, 2023; Krüger, 2021; Kurzweil, 2005; Last, 2020; Livingstone, 2015; Moore, 2019; Nordhaus, 2021; O'Neill, 2016; Ranisch, and Sorgner, 2014; Rothblatt, 2011; Savin-Baden, 2022a, 2022b; Scaruffi, 2019; Schroeter, 2020; Seidel, 2008; Shanahan, 2015; Singla, Soni, Gautam, Bhattarai, Sharma, Sharma, and Kaur, 2023; Singularity Now!, 2017; Sisto, 2020; Soares, 2023; Solomonoff, 1985; Stokes, 2021; Vallejo, 2023; Vanorio, 2023; Vinge, 1993; Walsh, 2017).

In addition, each type of singularity had its own scenario. For technological singularity, Cadell Last clearly developed three critical scenarios. First, in the Artificial Intelligence (AI) scenario, machines were predicted to surpass human intellect, potentially automating labor and resources. However, it came with the risk of existential threats if AI goals greatly differed from human values. Next, the Intelligence Amplification (IA) scenario strongly pointed out that technology could enhance humans, blurring the line between biological and artificial in a transhuman state with heightened abilities and lifespans. Last, the Human-Technology Merger (HTM) scenario combined both previous two by envisioning a specific possibility where humans and intelligent machines highly co-evolved in a symbiotic relationship, leading to a hyper-technological society where the definition of "intelligent being" was elaborately redefined (Last, 2020). For economic singularity, Calum Chace clearly elaborated eight scenarios. First, the "No Change" argued that AI would not notably change the economy. Following this, "Racing with the Machines" introduced centaurs and icebergs: centaurs represented a collaboration between humans and AI to increase capabilities whereas icebergs described AI setting up new tasks, and fostering opportunities for diverse skills. Then, "Capitalism +Universal Basic Income (UBI)" proposed revised capitalism supplemented by UBI to intensively support individuals affected by automation. After that, "Fracture" suggested a society divided into a wealthy AI-owning elite and a jobless majority. Furthermore, "Collapse" strongly warned of social unrest and economic collapse resulting from technological unemployment. Moreover, "Protopia" envisioned an optimistic scenario where incremental technological advancements improved society. Lastly, "Collective Ownership and Decentralization" explored how blockchain technology enabled collective asset management to alleviate inequality (Chace, 2016).

Governmental Power Market-Ing in the VU-CHAOS World

"Governmental Power Market-ing in the VU-CHAOS World," authored by Jermsittiparsert, K., Gohwong, S., Pavapanunkul, S., and Mahittichatkul, N., elaborately delved into various facets of governmental power, such as the rise of gerontocracy, and hidden agendas in governmental power market-ing theory and so on. After that, they elaborately examined critical factors influencing governmental purchasing behavior and its implications for power control. Last, they established criteria for evaluating governmental power market-ing, named

Governmental Power Market-Ing Excellence on Return on Investment (GROI) (Jermsittiparsert et al., 2023).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study extensively utilized in-depth documentary analysis. The data were elaborately collected from diverse and up-to-date sources, encompassing books, peer-reviewed publications, and credible online resources.

RESEARCH RESULTS

The study comprehensively explored two relationships between kakistoscryptocracy and singularity: one concerning technological advancements and another regarding economic ones (Particularly thanks to Awret, 2016; Banafa, 2024; Blake, Shakespeare, Molloy, 2012; Chace, 2016, 2018; Chalmers, 2016; Chesi and Spiegel, 2020; Clark, 2003; Callaghan, Miller, Yampolskiy, and Armstrong, 2017; Eden, Moor, Søraker, and Steinhart, 2012; Edmonds, 2021; Ferrando, 2019; Fukuyama, 2022; Goertzel and Goertzel, 2015; Geraci, 2010; Gohwong, 2023a, 2023b; Good, 1966; Hamilton and Lau, 2024;.Harbinja, 2023; Jalšenjak, 2020; Kneese, 2023; Krüger, 2021; Kurzweil, 2005; Last, 2020; Livingstone, 2015; Moore, 2019; Nordhaus, 2021; O'Neill, 2016; Ranisch, and Sorgner, 2014; Rothblatt, 2011; Savin-Baden, 2022a, 2022b; Scaruffi, 2019; Schroeter, 2020; Seidel, 2008; Shanahan, 2015; Singla, Soni, Gautam, Bhattarai, Sharma, Sharma, and Kaur, 2023; Singularity Now!, 2017; Sisto, 2020; Soares, 2023; Solomonoff, 1985; Stokes, 2021; Vallejo, 2023; Vanorio, 2023; Vinge, 1993; Walsh, 2017).

Kakistoscryptocracy obviously came along with the three scenarios of technological singularity. First, in the AI scenario, Kakistoscryptocracy intensively allowed non-state actors to use AI to build up and use power for their own gain beyond traditional governmental control. For example, they freely used AI to manipulate information to compromise state sovereignty and societal order. Another example, they could also use AI to increase inequalities and social tensions if the AI's goals of these free actors differed from human values. Malicious actors could freely use AI to disrupt some critical information infrastructure (CII) for personal gain. Next, in the IA scenario, these actors could arbitrarily use Web 3.0 technologies, including blockchain and the metaverse, to establish and use their power beyond conventional sovereignty. The abuse and misuse of AI like this, as a consequence, could also increase the digital divide between the haves and the have-nots. This could lead to a dystopian society where a technologically elite class dominated the rest of the population. Last, in the Human-Technology Merger (HTM) scenario, Kakistoscryptocracy catalyzed the evolution of hyper-technological societies, which obviously enabled these actors to co-evolve with AI to reshape societal norms and structures for their own gain. For example, these actors highly influenced this co-evolution for their benefit by inventing a set of non-government-based cryptocurrencies (NGCs) where machines strongly dominated humans.

Regarding economic singularity, Kakistoscryptocracy obviously matched with various Chace's scenarios. First, the "Fracture" scenario, linked to Kakistoscryptocracy, foresaw a society clearly divided between a rich, technologically elite class and a jobless majorities. AI and automation highly worsened this gap, with some exploiting technology to automate jobs, causing widespread unemployment and inequality. Moreover, NGCs also made things worse, creating an advanced financial system under digital settings favoring the wealthy. Secondly, the "Collapse" scenario clearly showed how unregulated technology could pose serious perils. In such an uncontrollable system like Kakistoscryptocracy, non-state actors freely used these advanced techs for illicit activities, such as money laundering, terrorism financing, fraudulence, and cryptojacking. This inevitably destabilized financial markets, weakened traditional governance, and caused social unrest and economic breakdown. The rise of NGCs in these

settings obviously made economic systems much more complicated by challenging standard macroeconomic ideas of money control and regulation. These illicit activities under anarchical settings, particularly through countless dark web marketplaces, could lessen trust in financial institutions, such as the central bank and commercial banks, destabilize the global economy, and contribute to the global economic collapse. Third, the "Collective Ownership and Decentralization" scenario evidently provided a positive future where Kakistoscryptocracy could alter the economic system using blockchain technology and decentralized asset management. It clearly imagined net states and influential FinTech companies controlling resources in a new way, challenging traditional capitalist structures. Blockchain in Kakistoscryptocracy could balance power by allowing collective asset management, potentially reducing inequality and creating new paths for empowerment. Despite other negative scenarios, this one as the best scenario obviously gave hope for the sustainable co-existence between humans and AIs. However, its success relied on taking control of blockchain from the non-state actors who highly dominated the Kakistoscryptocracy. Last, Kakistoscryptocracy absolutely contrasted with several economic singularity scenarios. It strongly opposed the "No Change" scenario by directly advocating an unregulated setting where non-state actors freely exploited advanced IT and AI to arbitrarily bypass regulations and create countless black markets in underground websites. It also starkly disrupted the "Capitalism + UBI" model, possibly worsening inequality by allowing technology controllers to exploit UBI-dependent individuals extremely. In the "Racing with the Machines" scenario, it could monopolize AI advancements by creating an awful situation where "centaurs" (human-AI teams) were extraordinarily controlled by a select few, leaving the majorities behind as "icebergs" with limited access to new opportunities. Similarly, it directly attacked the "Protopia" scenario, it greatly hastened economic destabilization and social unrest from lots of unchecked illegal activities (such as cryptojacking), potentially leading to dystopian outcomes. For instance, if cryptojacking had become widespread and targeted lower-income individuals, people who highly relied on their devices could be disproportionately affected by the resulting slowdown caused by cybercrime.

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

According to the findings, there are four critical issues of Kakistoscryptocracy in Technological and Economic Singularity as follows: unchecked use of AI for malicious purposes (technological singularity), widening wealth gap due to AI and automation (fracture scenario in economic singularity), unregulated technology facilitates illegal activities (collapse scenario in economic singularity), and control of blockchain by non-state actors (collective ownership and decentralization in economic singularity). First, in an envisioned future with unchecked AI misuse, fake news, and social bots starkly manipulate public opinion. Next, the fracture scenario predicts a widening wealth gap due to AI and automation, leaving majorities unemployed while a few become richer. Then, the collapse scenario directly warned of the dangers of unregulated technology, particularly NGCs, facilitating illegal activities (such as cryptojacking, terrorism financing, and money laundering). Lastly, very high concerns arose regarding active non-state actors controlling blockchain, potentially helping in numerous criminal activities, thus intensively challenging law enforcement and national security efforts. In this part, by using government power market-ing (GPM) strategies, governments can systematically mitigate these high risks from AI, singularity (both technological and economic), and kakistoscryptocracy. The "Governmental Power Market-Ing in the VU-CHAOS World" intensively provides a comprehensive framework for how governments use market-ing techniques to elaborately communicate with citizens and influence behavior to gain and maintain their power. This is particularly relevant in addressing the high risks of Kakistoscryptocracy in singularity-based scenarios. First, in the case of unchecked use of AI

for any malicious purposes (technological singularity), GPM strategies can promote high public awareness of potential AI misuse and educate citizens on how to precisely identify fake news and social bot activities. Governments can highly collaborate with net states (such as Yandex, VKontakte, and Kaspersky Lab) and FinTech companies to fully and thoroughly develop ethical complete guidelines for AI development and deployment. GPM campaigns can gain high public support for regulations that strongly prevent AI from being used for malicious affairs. Next, in a widening wealth gap due to AI and automation (fracture scenario in economic singularity), GPM can promote government initiatives that provide targeted citizens with the skills they really need in the AI economy. This includes upskilling and reskilling programs, as well as promoting innovation by encouraging investment in new industries and technologies that create new jobs. GPM campaigns can also build strong public backing for Universal Basic Income (UBI) that could help mitigate the economic impact of job displacement. Then, in the unregulated technology facilitating illegal activities (collapse scenario in economic singularity), GPM can gain public support for regulations that address the misuse of cryptocurrencies for illegal activities, promote collaboration between governments and tech companies to develop tools and strategies for combating cybercrime and educate citizens about the risks of cryptojacking and other cyber threats through public awareness campaigns. Last, in the extensive control of blockchain by non-state actors (collective ownership and decentralization in economic singularity), GPM can foster good partnerships between governments, net states, and FinTech companies to methodically develop and deploy secure blockchain technologies, encourage the development of open-source blockchain platforms that are less susceptible to control by non-state actors, and champion the development of international standards for blockchain technology to promote high responsible use.

In summary, this study clearly examined the high risks of kakistoscryptocracy (rule by malicious non-state actors using unregulated NGCs, AI, and other advanced technologies) in a future under both technological and economic singularity. It systematically had explored how governments could use government power market-ing (GPM) strategies to significantly mitigate these risks. By effectively communicating and influencing citizen behavior through GPM, governments had been able to play a key role in this awkward situation. This approach tremendously helped us navigate a future that was shaped by these rapid technological advancements.

REFERENCES

Awret, U. (2016). *The Singularity: Could artificial intelligence really out-think us (and would we want it to?)*. Andrews UK Limited.

Banafa, A. (2024). *Introduction to Artificial Intelligence (AI)*. 1st ed. Gistrup, Denmark: River Publishers.

Blake, C., Shakespeare, S., & Molloy, C. (2012). *Beyond human: From animality to transhumanism*. London: Continuum International Publishing.

Chace, C. (2016). *The Economic Singularity: Artificial intelligence and the death of capitalism*. Three Cs.

Chace, C. (2018). *Artificial intelligence and the two singularities*. FL: CRC Press/Taylor & Francis Group.

Chalmers, D. J. (2016). The singularity: A philosophical analysis. *Science fiction and philosophy: From time travel to super intelligence* (pp. 171-224). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Chesi, G. M., & Spiegel, F. (2020). *Classical Literature and Posthumanism*. NY: Bloomsbury Academic.

Clark, A. (2003). *Natural-Born Cyborgs: Minds, Technologies, and the Future of Human Intelligence*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Callaghan, V., Miller, J., Yampolskiy, R., & Armstrong, S. (2017). *The Technological Singularity: Managing the Journey*. Berlin: Springer.

Eden, A. H., Moor, J. H., Søraker, J. H., & Steinhart, E. (2012). *Singularity Hypotheses: A Scientific and Philosophical Assessment*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

Edmonds, D. (2021). *Future Morality*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Einstein, A. (1970). *The meaning of relativity*. NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ferrando, F. (2019). *Philosophical Posthumanism*. NY: Bloomsbury Academic.

Fukuyama, F. (2002). *Our Posthuman Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Goertzel, B., & Goertzel, T. (2015). *The End of the Beginning: Life, Society and Economy on the Brink of the Singularity*. Humanity+ Press.

Geraci, R. M. (2010). *Apocalyptic AI: Visions of heaven in robotics, artificial intelligence, and virtual reality*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Gohwong, S. (2023a). Kakistoscryptocracy. *Asian Political Science Review, 7*(1).

Gohwong, S. (2023b). Russian Net States and Their Roles in Russia. *Procedia of Multidisciplinary Research, 1*(11), 11.

Good, I. J. (1966). Speculations concerning the first ultraintelligent machine. In F. Alt & M. Ruminoff (Eds.), *Advances in Computers, volume 6* (pp. 31-88). Academic Press.

Hamilton, G., & Lau, C. (Eds.). (2024). *Mapping the Posthuman*. NY: Routledge.

Harbinja, E. (2023). *Digital Death, Digital Assets and Post-Mortem Privacy*. Edinburgh: University Press Ltd.

Hilpisch, Y. (2021). *Artificial Intelligence in Finance: A Python-Based Guide*. CA: O'Reilly Media.

Jalšenjak, B. (2020). The Artificial Intelligence Singularity: What It Is and What It Is Not. In Skansi, S. (eds) *Guide to Deep Learning Basics*. Springer, Cham.

Jermsittiparsert, K., Gohwong, S., Pavapanunkul, S., Mahittichatkul, N. (2023). *Governmental power market-ing in the VU-CHAOS world*. PA: IGI Global.

Kneese, T. (2023). *Death Glitch: How techno-solutionism fails us in this life and beyond*. CT: Yale University Press.

Krüger, O. (2021). *Virtual Immortality-God, Evolution, and the Singularity in Post- and Transhumanism*. Translated by A. Jones & P. Knight. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Kurzweil, R. (2005). *The Singularity Is Near: When Humans Transcend Biology*. NY: Viking Penguin.

Last, C. (2020). *Global Brain Singularity: Universal History, Future Evolution and Humanity's Dialectical Horizon*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature Switzerland AG.

Livingstone, D. (2015). *Transhumanism: The History of a Dangerous Idea*. Sabilillah Publications.

Moore, P. (2019). *Earthly Immortalities: How the Dead Live On in the Lives of Others*. London: Reaktion Books Ltd.

Nordhaus, W. D. (2021). Are We Approaching an Economic Singularity? Information Technology and the Future of Economic Growth. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics, 13*(1), 299-332.

O'Neill, K. (2016). *Internet Afterlife: Virtual Salvation in the 21st Century*. CA: Praeger.

Rishel, N. M. (2011). Rethinking difference in public administration. *Administrative Theory & Praxis, 33*(1), 112-116.

Ranisch, R., & Sorgner, S. L. (2014). *Post-and Transhumanism: An Introduction*. NY: Peter Lang GmbH.

Rothblatt, M. (2011). *From Transgender to Transhuman: A Manifesto on the Freedom of Form*. Martine Rothblatt.

Savin-Baden, M. (2022a). *AI for death and dying*. 1st ed. FL: CRC Press.

Savin-Baden, M. (2022b). *Digital Afterlife and the Spiritual Realm*. 1st ed. FL: CRC Press.
Scaruffi, P. (2019). *Intelligence is not Artificial (Expanded Edition)*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
Schroeter, J. (2020). *After Shock: The World's Foremost Futurists Reflect on 50 Years of Future Shock--and Look Ahead to the Next 50*. Abundant World Institute.
Seidel, A. (2008). *Inhuman Thoughts: Philosophical Explorations of Posthumanity*. MD: Lexington Books.
Shanahan, M. (2015). *The Technological Singularity*. The MIT Press.
Singla, D., Soni, V., Gautam, N. G., Bhattarai, S., Sharma, A., Sharma, A., & Kaur, N. (2023). *A Review of Recent Advances in Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning*. Kilby, 100, 7th international joint conference on computing sciences.
Singularity Now! (2017). *Singularity Now! The Artificial Intelligence Timeline: A reader's and investor's guide to the technological event horizon, artificial intelligence, automation, robotics and beyond (Spring 2017)*. Independently Published.
Sisto, D. (2020). *Online Afterlives: Immortality, Memory, and Grief in Digital Culture*. Translated by B. McClellan-Broussard. MA: The MIT Press.
Soares, L. H. (2023). *The technological singularity: A realistic overview*. Retrieved June, 13, 2023.
Solomonoff, R. J. (1985). The time scale of artificial intelligence: Reflections on social effects. *Human Systems Management, 5*(2), 149-153.
Stokes, P. (2021). *Digital Souls: A Philosophy of Online Death*. NY: Bloomsbury Academic.
Vallejo, P. A. (2023). *Singularity and Robotics: The Awakening of Artificial Intelligence from the Laboratory to the Real World*. Independently Published.
Vanorio, F. (2023). Technological Innovations: A New Model of Geopolitical Digital Relations from Welfare to Warfare?. In *Monetary Policy Normalization: One Hundred Years After Keynes' Tract on Monetary Reform* (pp. 173-183). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
Ulam, S. (1958). Tribute to John von Neumann. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society, 64*(3), 1-49.
Vinge, V. (1993). The coming technological singularity: How to survive in the post-human era. *Science fiction criticism: An anthology of essential writings, 81*, 352-363.
Von Neumann, J., & Kurzweil, R. (2012). *The computer and the brain*. 3rd ed. Yale University press.
Walsh, T. (2017). The Singularity May Never Be Near. *AI Magazine, 38*(3), 58-62.

Data Availability Statement: The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.