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# Introduction

In this chapter we show that one of the convergent drives of AI is one toward militarization. This drive arises from AI’s need to wage a war against its potential rivals by either physical or software means, or to increase its bargaining power. This militarization trend increases the risks of a global catastrophe during AI takeoff. The type and intensity of the militarization drive will depend on the relative speed of the AI takeoff and the number of potential rivals. We will show that AI’s militarization drive and the evolution of national defense will merge, as AI created in the defense environment will have quicker takeoff speeds, but a distorted value system.

Bostrom, Yudkowsky, Yampolskiy, and others showed that creation of the self-improving superintelligent AI is a real possibility in the next few decades or centuries (Baum, 2016; Bostrom, 2014; Yampolskiy, 2015b; Yudkowsky, 2008).

Omohundro (2008) demonstrated that such an AI will evolve several basic drives, or universal subgoals, independent of its main goal. These include acquiring as many resources as possible and self-preservation; these basic drives appear as a result of convergent paths of AI development. AI systems that are initially quite different will eventually behave as if they have such goals. Bostrom later listed the following convergent AI drives (Bostrom, 2014):

* Self-preservation,
* Goal-content integrity: protecting values from changing,
* Cognitive enhancement: drive to self-improve,
* Technological perfection: creation of new technological solutions
* Resource acquisition.

Shulman also explored AI drives and the probability of cooperation with humans at the early stages of AI development (Shulman, 2010). Gwern showed that convergent goals also appear in the behavior of Tool AI (an AI which doesn’t have independent agency, that is the ability to model itself and plan its actions), which would tend to become agential AI (Gwern, 2016). Benson-Tilson and Soares (2016) also explored convergent goals of AI and showed that AI may tend to become dangerously resource hungry, even if its initial goals are benevolent. Such a change is especially likely in contexts of rivalry with other agents. They wrote: “Our model predicts that intelligent rational agents will engage in trade and cooperation, but only so long as the gains from trading and cooperating are higher than the gains available to the agent by taking those resources by force or other means” (Benson-Tilsen & Soares, 2016).

The militarization of narrow AI is receiving increasing attention (Tetlow, 2017). On 1 September 2017, Russian president Vladimir Putin said that the one who will create AI first will be the ruler of the world (Putin, 2017), clearly implying that AGI will provide colossal military capabilities. More than 1000 scientists signed a letter against military drones and autonomous weapons (“Autonomous weapons: an open letter from AI & robotics researchers,” 2017), and another group of scientists has warned about the risks of self-improving AI (Bostrom, 2014). Yampolskiy created a taxonomy of paths to dangerous AI (Yampolskiy, 2015b), and a model of malevolent AI (Pistono & Yampolskiy, 2016).

A large review article, “Artificial intelligence and the future of defense”, has been prepared by The Hague Centre for Strategic Studies (De Spiegeleire, Maas, & Sweijs, 2017). In that work they showed that not only robotic drones, but strategic planning and a different level of organization inside the military becomes increasingly affected by AI development, and national defense evolves in the direction of superintelligent AI. They wrote: “Throughout history, intelligence—the computational part of the ability to achieve goals in the world—has played a critical role in deciding who came out on top in various contests of wills” (De Spiegeleire et al., 2017).

The militarization trend of early self-improving AI is underexplored, because it is typically assumed that the first superintelligent AI will be infinitely stronger than any of its rivals (Bostrom, 2014; Yudkowsky, 2008). This conclusion is based on the idea that acceleration of the AI’s self-improvement will make the distance between rivals larger. As a result, it is expected that the first such AI could use minimally invasive actions to defeat its rivals. Most authors do not even think this should be called a military action, as there will be no perceived harm and no typical human military hardware will be used. However, this scenario will occur only if several assumptions about the speed of self-improvement, the achievement distance between each AI research team, and the “environmental level of AI” are true (Turchin & Denkenberger, 2017b).

Another reason for ignoring AI’s militarization is the widespread assumption that even if superintelligent AI creates military infrastructure, the AI will use its military capabilities carefully. In such a case, the total probability of global risks and other negative consequences will decrease. But 1) early stage self-improving AI will not be superintelligent immediately, and its militarization could happen before the AI reaches superhuman prediction capabilities; 2) the appearance of several AIs will increase global complexity and lower predictability; 3) war between two superintelligences may have catastrophic outcomes.

Advanced AI interference in its enemies’ behavior could take the form of subtle Internet action or even small nanobots that penetrate human brains (Yudkowsky, 2008). Bear in mind that from the point of view of the victims, such actions are not subtle, as the victims lose their ability to influence the future according to their goal system—they lose everything.

Yamploskiy wrote that AI is unlikely to create its own military infrastructure, as that will make it highly visible. It will probably seize existing nuclear weapons or build very small and sophisticated weapons, perhaps biological weapons (Pistono & Yampolskiy, 2016). We redefine *militarization* as creation of instruments able to kill the opponent or change his will without negotiations, as well as a set of the strategic postures (Kahn, 1959), designed to bring victory in a global domination game.

In 2017, an extensive rebuttal to the widely discussed risks of lethal autonomous weapons (LAW) was published in the effective-altruist forum. In it, the author argues that such weapons will be more precise than human-controlled ones and thus less dangerous (Bogosian, 2017). But in this article, we do not discuss robots controlled by narrow AI, but the prospects of the evolution of a large AI system, closer to general intelligence.

Military science has already explored possible relations between superhuman rational agents in the case of nuclear deterrence analysis (Kahn, 1959), but this source of insight remains largely untapped in the AI safety literature. A large report, “Artificial intelligence and national security”, (Allen & Chan, 2017) which touches on global catastrophic risks of AI, was prepared in 2017 for the U.S. research foundation IARPA. The document illustrates a perspective of a future merger between the civilian AI field and the U.S. military.

In this article, we explore why military AI will almost inevitably arise during an AI world takeover, the kinds of risks military AI creates, and what can be done to minimize the risks. In Section 2, we explore the routes to AI evolution which could converge into military AI creation. In Section 3, we discuss the negative consequences of AI militarization. In Section 4, we address the possible arms race between two AIs, with reference to an important prediction by Stanislav Lem. Section 5 is devoted to the expected convergence between national defense and AI development. In Section 6, we explore the effect of AI militarization on its values, public relations (PR) and legal positions. In conclusion, we list potential ways to create global benevolent AI without catalyzing a world military takeover.

# 2. AI must converge into military AI to secure global power

Any AI system, which has subgoals of its own long-term existence or unbounded goals that would affect the entire surface of the Earth, will also have a subgoal to win power over its actual and possible rivals. This subgoal requires the construction of all instruments needed for such a win, that is militarization.

This is true for both benevolent AI (aimed at the creation of the maximum possible good for humans) and for AI that is not aligned to human goals, if its goals are not bounded in space or time. Now we will show how even initially benevolent AI may become dangerous military AI and produce a global catastrophe, but the same is true for non-benevolent AIs and even for the systems which are not initially utility maximizers (see section 2.5).

## 2.1. Historical examples of the militarization of positive ideas

Historically, there are many examples of how a positive idea, intended to improve human life, can produce enormous military empires, wars, and human suffering.

First of all, the history of all religions is full of sectarian violence. Christianity presented itself as a religion of love, but Christian empires waged wars with barbarians and between themselves.

While the declared goal of communism was improving the lives of working people, the idea seemed to its proponents to be workable only if communism were implemented everywhere in the world. After communists took power in Russia, there was a discussion between Stalin and Trotsky about the possibility of the creation of socialism in one country or the need for global revolution (which they called “permanent revolution theory”) (Trotsky, 1939). While Trotsky lost the struggle for power, Stalin adopted Trotsky’s idea of the need to take over the world and pursued expansionist politics after World War II. The Cold War consumed a large part of the USSR’s resources, and as a result, the Soviet economy failed. The Cold War put the world at risk, as an enormous amount of nuclear weapons and other military hardware was created; in addition, many people lost their life in regional conflicts fueled by the Cold War. Thus, the initially positive goal of improving people’s lives resulted in the risk of global nuclear war.

The problem of the militarization subgoal of a good idea is that militarization creates more suffering than expected and increases the chances of failure and of catastrophic risks. It also results in goal drift and the development of new global risks. Thus, the total utility of the project is often negative.

## 2.2. Definition of military struggle according to military science

According to Clausewitz, war is a continuation of politics by other means (Clausewitz, 1832). In other words, it is a method of achieving goals without negotiating them, but by using power to affect the opponent. There are two types of war, according to Clausewitz: 1) war to achieve limited aims, which means to change the will of the enemy, and 2) total war, with the goal of completely crushing the enemy, “to render [the enemy] politically helpless or militarily impotent”.

Obviously, the threat to existence is the most powerful mean of affecting the will of the opponent, so both types of war converge. This became obvious in the wars of the 20th century, reaching its culmination in the doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD).

War is defined through the way it affects the will and existence of the opponent, not through the types of military hardware used, the number of casualties, or the degree of suffering. All of these are only byproducts of war. Typical military hardware, like tanks and bombs, are simply some of the possible instruments of war, and such hardware could even be used for different goals, like playing games or firefighting on oil rigs.

Many current instruments of war are “soft”, including those used in examples including radiowar, informational war (fake news) (Anderson & Horvath, 2017), and cyber-attacks. But their “soft” nature does not make them less damaging to the enemy’s will. War is evolving to softer forms, but such softer forms are more effective in attacking core values.

## 2.3. AI’s enemies

When the first superintelligent AI appears, probably as a result of the process of recursive self-improvement (RSI), it will likely have some set of goals which motivate it to self-improve and to continue its existence. As we said above, if the AI’s goals are unbounded in space and time, or at least cover all of Earth’s surface, they will come in conflict with the goals of other actually existing or possible AI systems, humans, or nation states. In this conflict, there will be clear winners and losers. In other words, unbounded utility functions require fighting with rivals, and this produces arms races, militarization and wars.

Thus, the first superintelligent AI will have a subgoal to take over the world, because this is the main way of stopping all its possible enemies and a method that embodies its self-preservation drive. The resource acquisition drive also requires full global power, e.g., the paperclip maximizer (Yudkowsky, 2008) needs all atoms. If an AI does not have a world domination subgoal, its effect on the global events will probably be relatively small, and its existence could be neglected.

Many possible terminal goals also imply that the AI has to take over the world. They include even benevolent subgoals: benevolent AI needs to be able to reach all people living in the world to protect them from other AIs.

In order to take over the world, the AI has to defeat several potential enemies and to do so, it needs various instruments or arms. There are four distinctive types of AI enemies:

1. **AI’s owners or creators.** The AI needs to breach its containment and prevent the possibility of being turned off by its creators. To do so, the AI may implement a trick, like in the “AI box experiment” (Yudkowsky, 2002), or search for software vulnerabilities. The AI may evolve the qualities of a cyber weapon, combining phishing and hacking to get out of its box.
2. **Nation states.** Nation states, and especially superpowers, are currently the entities with the most power in the world. If the AI is going to take over the world, it must strip power from the nation states. It is often assumed that nation states will be 20th-century-style enemies, while AI will be a superintelligent entity living in the Internet and using nanotechnology to manipulate the outside world (Yudkowsky, 2008). In that case, AI will be able to use clouds of nanobots to disarm nuclear weapons. Such action, despite appearing peaceful externally, will be an act of war from the point of view of the nuclear power. However, contemporary nation-states are evolving and adopting various cyber weapons and AI technologies, so the difference in power between nation states and the evolving AI may be not so large. A smaller power differential could mean a more violent conflict.
3. **Other teams working on AIs.** The AI must prevent other teams from creating other AIs—as well as stop its own creators from starting a second instance of the same AI with different goals. This will probably be an even more urgent goal than disarming nation states, because fighting other AIs may be much more difficult. Its work toward this goal may take the form of simpler actions, like erasing hard drives, making late-night calls to researchers to disrupt or intimidate them, and hacking computers and inserting errors in code. To do so effectively, the AI must develop its hacking capabilities more than its other capabilities.
4. **Other AIs (if they appear).** The conventional wisdom is that hard takeoff will produce only one AI (Yudkowsky & Hanson, 2008). However, this depends on the number of AI teams in the world, the median time between their success(es), and the levels of information transparency in the field (Bostrom, 2017). If there are 1000 teams, and they are randomly distributed on a one-year timeline to success, then the median time between the first and second AI appearing will be around eight hours. However, though there probably are 1000 AI teams, most of them are pursuing narrow AI, not artificial general intelligence (AGI).

Some analogous cases of parallel research can be found in history. Two patents for the telephone were filed within two hours on March 7, 1876, by Bell and Grey respectively (Baker, 2000). This was the result of a tight race with some information exchange between competitors; the race ended with a long patent war in the courts. Other competitors were slightly further behind. Another example of a very tight race is the competition to return a sample from the Moon. The Soviet probe Luna 15 tried to land on Moon three days before Apollo 11, but crashed.

If the AI produced by one team starts RSI, and another team learns of the first team’s actions, the second team may rush to start RSI with their own AI, even if it is not ready yet. As a result, several AIs undergoing self-improvement simultaneously becomes more probable.

The outcome of this double launch depends on whether the achievement distance between first and second mover grows or diminishes. Bostrom expects that it will grow (Bostrom, 2014), as recalcitrance to further improvement will diminish. Yampolskiy (2015a) presents arguments that progress in intelligence may follow a logarithmic law, and so the difference between the two AIs will diminish. If the difference diminishes, several AIs of comparable power will appear on Earth.

5. **Hypothetical enemies.** Even if only one superintelligent AI appears, it may consider the possibility that a rival system will be appear later, or that it will meet alien AI in space.

## 2.4. Unbounded utilitarianism requires that AI take over the known universe and postpone its final goals

If the AI value function is presented in the unbounded form, like “create as many happy people as possible”, the AI has to engage in near speed-of-light colonization of the visible universe, starting an intelligence explosion shockwave.

The instruments used to conquer the universe may also be regarded as military hardware; the use of phrases like “explosion shockwave” underlines this analogy. They will surely be weapons from the point of view of any aliens, if they exist.

The AI may also postpone the realization of any positive values it has until it takes over a large part of the universe or until near heat death of the universe (Sandberg, Armstrong, & Cirkovic, 2017). The risks here are that the best conditions will be never reached. For example, the AI may choose to fight to the end of the universe, then the end of the multiverse, with no resolution.

## 2.5. Even non-utilitarian AI will either temporarily converge into a military utility maximizer or it will lose the world domination battle

A pure unbounded utility maximizer could be dangerous, no matter what its utility function, as it will aggressively maximize utility, ignoring all real-world complexity. For example, the famous paperclip maximizer would measure its utility by the number of paperclips it created.

However, in the case of a militarization trend, even a non-utility maximizing mind with an arbitrary set of final goals has a dilemma: it will either lose the competition and disappear, or it will temporary converge into a utility maximizer with a set of military goals—that is, the set of goals needed to dominate its rivals.

Military goals are relatively easy to measure: the outcomes are either a win or a loss. There are also some proxies to measure progress, like the amount of resources controlled (though not as good as in case of economy, where money is a direct linear measure of success, and in cases of military confrontation the uncertainty is much larger).

The possibility to measure the military progress creates an opportunity to formulate the task in terms of utility maximization. Thus, even a non-utilitarian mind will have a pressure to converge into a utility maximizer until it wins (or loses). This is analogous to civilians having to reject their diversity and put on a military uniform in time of war.

# 3. AI militarization drive increases global risks

## 3.1. AI must produce arms, able to create a global catastrophe, to fight the war for world domination

As we showed above, only AI systems orientated toward global dominance will obtain it. To achieve that goal, they need to be able to win a war. To win such a war, the AI may use any instruments, even if its final goal is benevolent to humans, as long as the AI expects that final outcome will provide higher utility. Such instruments may include killing people (Thomson, 1985), blackmailing by creation of a Doomsday weapon (Kahn, 1959), mass rewriting of human preferences, using of nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction, and developing new kinds of weapons (such as nanoweapons) (Yudkowsky, 2008). However, as war is intrinsically unpredictable, such instruments may spiral out of control.

The scale of such a war depends on the comparative advantage of the first AI over all its potential enemies. To gain a large advantage, it must quickly undergo extensive self-improvement, which is itself a risky and unpredictable process (Turchin & Denkenberger, 2017b). The AI must also evade many potential methods of AI control, such as circuit breaking (or an “off switch”) which detects improvement and turns off the AI. If the AI accidentally halted, it would lose control over its arms, which could then become even more dangerous.

The AI’s abilities for strategic planning could be even more important than its weapons. Such skills can be assessed by playing strategically complex games. AI is already winning at games similar to war, including chess and Gо. However, many historical wars have been won by violating previous “rules” of war, thus AI must reach a high level of generalization for these skills to be applicable. If geopolitics could be simplified to such a game, AI could start winning even now, without intelligence explosion (Mennen, 2017).

## 3.2. The war to take over the world may be not as easy as expected

The war for global domination may not be as easy as expected because there is a chance that other AIs may appear. The first AI has to either grow very quickly, choosing riskier paths to self-improvement (Turchin & Denkenberger, 2017b)—which may result in bugs or AI halting, or face the existence of AI opponents.

Clausewitz wrote that war is always more difficult than expected (Clausewitz, 1832). Unexpected consequences could increase the price of war compared to its expected utility. It is reasonable to expect that superhuman AI will be able to calculate such a trade-off. However, that is true only if it has already reached a superintelligent level and its opponents are much weaker. Young and time-constrained AI could make mistakes.

One possible counterargument to the risks of AI militarization drive is that as AI assumed to be superintelligent, it may envision in advance the distortion of its initial values by the militarization drive and balance the drive accordingly. However, this is true only if one AI exists; in the case of an AI arms race, there would be several rivals, and militarization and its risks would result from their interaction. For example, at the onset of the nuclear arms race in the 1940s, its potentially risky outcome was predicted by pundits. These people said that a large amount of sophisticated weapons would be created, capable of destroying humanity (“Preliminary Statement of the Association of Manhattan District Scientists,” 1945). Though the risks were known, this knowledge was not sufficient to stop the nuclear arms race.

## 3.3. Early stage benevolent AI may kill people

The strategy to take over the world will probably not differ much between a paperclip maximizer and a benevolent AI. Surely, a benevolent AI will prefer not to harm people, but if its success is in question, its calculations of the expected utility would demand that it sacrifices some lives of human beings to reach its extremely positive goal.

The same logic is often used by proponents of communism, as they claim that a small number of victims may be needed for the future happiness of billions of people. And this “small number” is millions of victims of wars, repressions, starvation etc. Similarly, recent research on the psychology of terrorists showed that they are more consequentialist than ordinary murderers (Baez et al., 2017).

History shows that this is a clear failure mode: there are millions of victims of communism, but there is still no ideal communist society. The victims died in vain. This is a failure mode of consequentialist ethics addressed by (Turchin & Denkenberger, 2017a).

## 3.4. Staging a global catastrophe may be the most effective way to eliminate opponents for the Young AI

If the takeoff of the first AI is relatively slow, it could have many rivals, including “brothers” with the same source code. Their location may be hidden or distributed. Staging a global catastrophe may prevent new rivals from appearing and developing, provided that the first AI has an independent energy source and a safe location. Even benevolent AI may use the threat of creating a global risk to blackmail all other players and advance its agenda.

Early stage AI will not be superintelligent yet, and it will be time constrained; thus, it will not be able to afford to spend much time seeking the best and most beautiful decision. It will likely prefer simpler and more brutal decisions, as their planning would require less computational complexity.

Technologically, early AI will only be capable of using simple means to stage a global catastrophe, like provoking a nuclear war, or creating a rather simple bioweapon or narrow AI computer virus to affect all existing robotics. If it can produce more advanced technology like its own nanotech, it could likely achieve world dominance without killing anyone.

We can put it another way: To take over the world, AI has to create tool AIs, which aim to kill people, destroy other machines, or affect human will. These tool AIs could be narrow AI viruses or programs that control nanоrobots. If the main AI halts or loses control over autonomous weapons, these weapons could continue to wage war or kill people. AI halting is rather plausible, as it could result from bugs, logical problems, or unpredicted consequences of its development. We have explored this in more detail with respect to levels of RSI (Turchin & Denkenberger, 2017b).

## 3.5. Two beneficial AIs could war with each other

The militarization of one AI will result in the militarization of its opponents. If two friendly AIs appear simultaneously, they may have a conflict about which one will provide maximum utility to human beings. Hopefully, they will be able to recognize each other as Friendly AI, and if their goal systems are the same, one of them could turn off. If their goal systems are not exactly the same but do not contradict each other in the main details, they could merge into one AI, or use some form of cooperative decision theory to work together.

However, one of them could suspect that the other is lying about its goal system. MIRI suggested that AIs could present each other source code and use it to verify willingness to mutually cooperate and their final goals (LaVictoire et al., 2014), but source code could be faked.

Thus, if at least one of them (and there could more than two) did not engage in full cooperation, or if mutual cooperation can’t be proved to all sides, then all AIs would have to militarize against each other. It could take the form of a cold war, where the AIs have a truce, but simultaneously prepare for a potential war with each other—thereby protecting themselves from being turned off by force.

Such an arms race could include a build-up of enormous amounts of sophisticated weaponry. If a hot war accidentally started, it could be much more destructive than any possible human nuclear war. An AI arms race may help each AI to increase its bargaining position, even if none of them is planning actual war, similar to what happens between nation states.

If a war between AIs starts, humans may go extinct as a result of the collateral damage or counter-value war. The term counter-value war comes from nuclear doctrine; it means an attack on the enemy’s values, that is cities, but not on an enemy’s military assets (Kahn, 1959).

There are also two additional negative scenarios of war between two friendly AIs:

1. Creation of and blackmail with Doomsday weapons (Kahn, 1959). A Doomsday weapon is one which could destroy the world, taking the AIs and all humans with it. If multiple AIs create Doomsday weapons with mutually exclusive conditions, the catastrophe is inevitable, as in a “game of chicken”, where both players throw out their steering wheels to demonstrate that they will never swerve.
2. As both friendly AIs value human life and wellbeing, they could trade human lives and suffering with each other. One possibility is blackmailing each other by threatening to torture humans if the other AI will not turn itself off. In such a scenario, human suffering could be a currency between two AIs that claim to value human life.

## 3.6. AI safety problem at each new level of AI self-improvement: avoiding war with a new generation

As we have previously explored (Turchin & Denkenberger, 2017b), an AI has two main venues for self-improvement: either 1) change its code while running it, which could result in crashes, or 2) work on a copy of the source code, then run the copy and test it. This latter situation results in a possible conflict between a parent and child AI: The parent AI must turn off the child AI if it failed testing, but the child AI could successfully resist this shutdown since it possesses higher intelligence. The relation of parent AI and child AI is basically the same as between humans and the first AI; the problem of controlling child AI is the basic problem of AI safety all over again. Hence, AI will have a convergent goal to create AI safety theory to control its own next generations.

 If an AI decides to make changes to itself without working with copies, it must make lower-level changes. These lower-level changes would not affect the running core, and thus would give it less of a competitive advantage over rivals, so it is likely that a military AI would choose to improve its copies.

In a nutshell, the AI safety problem (Soares & Fallenstein, 2014) is how to create an AI that is better than humans, but in line with our values and safe for us. When this AI wants to make a new generation of AI, which will be much stronger than the first AI, it will meet all the same problems; thus, the AI will need to:

• Encode its own goals into a new generation of AI and preserve those goals during any future RSI.

• Perform a safe AI shutdown in case of failure at the testing stage (Orseau & Armstrong, 2016).

• Prevent risks from a child AI to the parent AI, if a child AI tries to shut down the parent AI before the end of the testing phase.

The problem of controlling the next generation may be easy for the AI if humans have already solved it by creating AI safety theory. But if the AI control problem was not properly solved, that is, if there is self-improving of a non-aligned AI, this AI may be the first entity to find such a solution.

This subgoal is beneficial to humans, as the parent AI may expect that a future child AI will behave towards the parent AI in the same way the parent AI behaved towards humans. This could incentivize the AI to prevent human death and suffering as part of an “acausal” deal (Bostrom, 2016) between different generations of AIs.

# 4. Arms race between nation states evolves into the race to create AI, and then into the arms race between two superintelligent AIs

## 4.1. Stanislav Lem’s prediction about AI arms race and its evolution into a global catastrophe

In his 1959 novel *Investigation*, S. Lem's character discusses the future of the US-Soviet arms race and AI (Lem, 1959). We present this text for the first time for the English reader, and thus a longer quote may be of interest.

Lem clearly showed that a conventional military arms race inevitably transforms itself into an arms race between two military AIs, where both AIs need to constantly self-improve and exclude humans from decision making.

*“—Well, it was somewhere in 1946, a nuclear race had started….But let’s assume they have reached the limit. What remains? The brain. Command staff’s brain.*

*The human brain can not be improved, so some automation should be taken on in this field as well. The next stage is an automated headquarters or strategic computers. And here is where an extremely interesting problem arises. Namely, two problems in parallel….*

*Firstly, is there any limit for development of this kind of brain? It is similar to chess-playing devices. A device which is able to foresee the opponent’s actions ten moves in advance always wins against one which sees eight or nine moves ahead. The deeper the foresight, the more perfect the brain is. This is the first thing.…*

*Creation of devices of increasingly bigger volume for strategic solutions means, regardless of whether we want it or not, the necessity to increase the amount of data put into the brain. It, in turn, means increasing domination of those devices over mass processes within a society. The brain can decide that the notorious button should be placed otherwise or that the production of a certain sort of steel should be increased—and will request loans for the purpose.*

*If the brain like this has been created, one should submit to it. If a parliament starts discussing whether the loans are to be issued, a delay will occur. The same minute, the counterpart can gain the lead. Abolition of parliament decisions is inevitable in the future.*

*The human control over solutions of the electronic brain will be narrowing as the latter will concentrate knowledge. Is it clear?*

*On both sides of the ocean, two continuously growing brains appear. What is the first demand of a brain like this, when, in the middle of an accelerating arms race, the next step will be needed? …*

 *The first demand is to increase it—the brain itself! All the rest is derivative.*

*—In a word, your forecast is that the earth will become a chessboard, and we —the pawns to be played by two mechanical players during the eternal game?...—Yes.”*

In the text following this excerpt, Lem’s protagonist concludes that the “chess game” between two such AIs will be even more destructive than nuclear war, so nuclear war is better.

## 4.2 AI arms race in the current world

In the current world, we see an AI arms race between the US and China (Ministry of National Defense of the People’s Republic of China, 2016), but it does not take the form envisioned by Lem: it is less driven by governments than by private companies. The worldwide demise of the planned economy, even in communist China, lowered the need for AI in government. The idea of using AI for a planned economy was never tried (though it was popular in the 1960s in the USSR). The second reason is long AI winters (periods of lower interest in AI), which undermined the idea of AI usefulness until recently. Also, democratic countries are not eager to replace their current governments with an electronic brain, so implementation of AI as government is lagging behind the use of AI in data gathering and cyberweapons.

As a result, the main AI arms race is currently taking place between commercial firms and universities. There also could be large clandestine military projects, but our knowledge about them lags for many years because of secrecy. The commercial sector is currently the most innovative in AI designs, so an AI arms race takes the form of governmental support of private AI research.

Historically it is known that militaries rarely invested in fundamental scientific research. However, militaries have historically been able to quickly seize promising research directions and massively accelerate them using generous funding, mobilization, and concentration of efforts. This has happened with nuclear (Smith, 2007), rocket, and computer technologies in the 1940s, but now DARPA and IARPA have filled the gap.

Even if many superintelligent AIs appear simultaneously, they may tend to converge into a two-AI semi-stable solution through force or alliances. We could conclude from the observation that two-party solutions appear over and over again, like the two party political systems in the US and UK, Apple and Microsoft in operating systems, Coca-Cola and Pepsi-Cola in carbonated beverages, etc. One reason for this is probably that smaller players tend to adhere to one of the two largest players. In politics, the tendency towards a two-party political system is called Duverger's law (Reed, 1990). But even during the Cold War, the situation was more complex than the two-agent solution, as China played a mostly independent game and there were players other than the USSR and the US.

## 4.3. Arms race as catalyser of AI militarization

An arms race between nation states could transform into an arms race to create the first AI, and then into the arms race between two AIs.

An arms race between AIs will increase the militarization drive, promote the riskiest approaches to self-improvement, and could be the consequence of a previous non-AI military arms race between nation states. Bostrom and others have previously explored the risks of arms race to create the first AI (Shulman & Armstrong, 2009), (Bostrom, Armstrong, & Shulman, 2013) (Tomasik, 2013), (Miller, 2012).

But after AI creation, an arms race could continue between AIs. Even if there is only one AI, it would still participate in this arms race, as it would need prevent the appearance of others.

If there is a hard takeoff, one AI will dominate. However, if the takeoff is slow (and “slow” is relative to the rate of AI production explored above), then many AIs would appear and could converge into a two AIs solution. Slow takeoff could also mean that AIs will gain power not exponentially, but slower than linearly, so their relative power will become more equal with time. This could also produce multiple AIs even if their appearance was not close in time. We have previously explored the speed of RSI (Turchin & Denkenberger, 2017b).

There is a possibility that implementation differences between two projects would cause an AI that arrived slightly later to accelerate faster than the first AI. Of course, the second AI must achieve that acceleration before the first prevents it. This could happen because of a technological spillover, where the second project could get insights from failures of the first one, or because of some technological espionage. It is known that such espionage helped the Soviet nuclear program in the 1940s; moreover, some spies, like Klaus Fuchs (Goodman, 2005), deliberately sent nuclear secrets to Russia, as they hoped it would more quickly create a balanced world.

A cold war is a semi-stable solution, as it has some self-regulating mechanisms preventing hot war, like MAD. But its stability is more like an attractor than a guarantee, as many close calls and near misses undermine it, and each side retains the hope that it will finally win.

The slower AI take-off is, the more probable the “many AIs” solution is, and the lower the relative technological distance between AIs will be. As a result, the AIs would have to invest more in military hardware of the destructive type, and less in the small, invasive, will-changing type.

# 5. Convergence of the AI militarization drive and national defense

## 5.1. Cooperation with humans at the early stages of AI development will offer advantages to military AI projects

There are two main paths to superintelligent AI. One of them is more based on human help and is more probable; however, the help will most likely come from a military project. These two paths are:

1. AI makes a treacherous turn, “revolts” against humans, and starts recursive self-improvement (Bostrom, 2014).

2. Humans help AI in all stages of its self-improving until AI reaches the desired level of intelligence and global dominance.

While variant 1 is the most popular in the literature (Bostrom, 2014), (Yudkowsky, 2008), it is much more difficult for the AI. This is because the AI will have two tasks, which it has to complete simultaneously: 1) escaping human control and 2) extensively changing itself internally. These tasks are mutually exclusive in some respects, because escaping requires a small size, agility, and attention to what is happening outside the AI, while self-improvement requires extended time paying attention inside itself and a larger program size.

More importantly, if the AI “revolted” against its owners at an early stage, it would have more enemies and more barriers to overcome than an AI that collaborated with human owners until they took over the world together. Humans also may help the AI if its RSI unexpectedly sticks at some stage, for example, if the AI halts. (We have previously examined this dynamic in more depth (Turchin & Denkenberger, 2017b).) Therefore, if there are many AI teams in the world, the team which AI completely collaborates with humans will have the advantage, as the AI’s RSI will go quicker and more smoothly.

An AI which is in accordance with its creators will (at the beginning) have an advantage against other AIs, which must fight with its own creators. This means that an AI that is helped by its human owners to get as much power as possible in the outside world will dominate. This would be more likely to happen if its owners are interested in using the AI not for solving exotic math problems, but for getting dominance over the outside world. That is, the owners will most likely be military or military-oriented.

This would result in a selection effect, where the quickest development would produce the first AIs, which would likely be created by resourceful militaries with a goal system explicitly oriented toward taking over the world. Indeed, government military agencies of a rogue country may create their own military AI with the explicit goal of taking advantage of its self-improving process to take over the world.

As a result, projects where developers and the AI cooperate towards a common goal of taking over the world will dominate over projects where the AI has to escape from initial confinement and overcome its creators. The AI could make a treacherous turn against its creators after it takes over the world.

A self-improving organization like Google may provide the best soil for such projects. But the main US IT-companies are private and not directly connected with the US military. However, if the military advantage of AI becomes clear, civil research may be seized by governmental agencies, as happened at the start of Manhattan project. In China, Baidu may be indirectly owned by the government.

## 5.2. Human defense organizations will converge into military AI

The extensive research project “Artificial intelligence and future of defense” shows that armies of the world accept AI in the form of military drones (De Spiegeleire et al., 2017), (Mackenzie, 2015). As narrow AI evolves, it will take on other functions of military organizations, including strategic planning, complex logistics, targeting, communication, and relations with political planning.

We could say that not only will AI converge into military AI, but defense organizations will converge into AI too, so both tendencies will meet. It is unfortunate that using the fictional example of Skynet has become vulgar in AI safety circles, as risks from non-self-improving, but powerful AI created by existing military organization have become underestimated.

## 5.3. Military AI is always aimed against part of humanity, and two such AIs could have a combined goal of global destruction

Military AI may also be programmed to kill large groups of people named “enemies”, and if the “non-enemies” group were to disappear for some reason, it may kill everybody. If two military AIs with mutually exclusive definitions of “non-enemies” exist, they could be equivalent to having one AI which has a goal of killing all humans.

Imagine that there are two sides in the world, A and non-A, which are enemies. If A has a value function to kill all non-A, and non-A wants to kill all A, then in a case of a mutual war they would seek to kill everybody. The actual world is more complex, but any weapon has the potential for collateral damage. For some weapons, the collateral damage is the most dangerous part, like nuclear winter, an unintended consequence of a war between two superpowers.

## 5.4. Flash-crash-style AI war

Nuclear weapons lessened the time of global war to half an hour. In the case of war between two military AIs it could be even less. The market “flash-crash” in 2010 (Easley, López de Prado, & O’Hara, 2011) was partly attributed to high-frequency computerized trading. A war between two military AIs may be similar to the flash-crash: two AIs competing with each other in a stable mode could, in a very short time (on a scale of minutes to milliseconds), lose that stability. They could start acting hostilely to each other, for example, attacking each other with stronger and stronger cyberweapons.

## 5.5. War between AIs and collateral damage

Collateral damage in the case of war is its civilian victims. Despite the growing accuracy of contemporary weapons, collateral damage is also still a factor, as militants tend to hide in the cities. The ratio of civilian to combatant victims was around 1 to 1 percent through history (Eckhardt, 1989), but it is estimated that it grew to 4 to 1 in Yugoslavia war in 1997 (Oren, 2009). While more precise weapons are lowering civilian casualties, militants’ tactic of hiding in densely populated areas is compensating for this trend.

If two AIs have are in conflict between each other, the consequences of could affect humans in two ways:

1. Other AI hardware is physically located on the same territory where people live, and attacking this territory kills humans
2. Two AIs attack each other, but consequences of their war spill outside the field of conflict and affect neutral countries. An example of such spillover is “nuclear winter” (Mills, Toon, Lee‐Taylor, & Robock, 2014), but in the case of AI war, it could be cyberweapons run amok.

As conflicting AIs will probably be hidden and distributed systems, they could not attack each other with precision, which would increase collateral damage.

## 5.6. Military AI failure modes

Recently many scientists signed a letter against lethal autonomous weapons (LAWs) (Future of life institute, 2017). But LAWs are not the same as military AI, and LAWs may be the safest part of military AI (Bogosian, 2017). De Spiegeleire and Maas et al. showed that military AI consists of several layers, where LAWs are on the lowest level (De Spiegeleire et al., 2017).

Advanced military AI (an AI system created by humans for military proposes) will probably include several other functions, some of which already exist:

1. Strategic planning for winning in war,

2. Direct control of all units inside the country's defense systems, which may include drones, ships, nuclear weapons, humans, and other large and small units,

3. Nuclear deterrence part, which consists of the early warning system and “dead hand” second strike system (which allows retaliation even if the damage is extensive),

4. Manufacturing and constructing new advanced weapons, and

5. Cyberweapons, e.g. instruments "to affect democratic elections" or to turn off adversaries' AI or other critical infrastructure.

Each of these 5 levels could have a global catastrophic failure, even without starting uncontrollable self-improvement.

Strategic planning AI may have a superhuman winning ability when it comes to games, e.g. *AlphaGo Zero* (Singh, Okun, & Jackson, 2017), but not when used as an army commander. A strategic AI could fail if it suggests "to strike first now or lose forever"(Kasparov, 2008). In addition, a global military-controlling AI system could propagate a wrong command.

An early warning system could create a false alarm—which has happened before (Future of Life Institute, 2016)—but in the case of an AI-driven warning system, it will be not so easy to recognize a mistake. There also could be a flash-crash-style unexpected war between two military AIs of two adversarial nation states.

Weapons manufacturing AI may be unexpectedly effective in creating very dangerous weapons, which could later be used with global consequences perhaps more severe than nuclear war. For example, the nuclear program in the 1940s resulted in much more effective weapons than were originally planned, such as thermonuclear bombs and the idea of the cobalt bomb (Smith, 2007).

The use of cyberweapons also may be regarded as an act of war or could help to elect a dangerously unstable president (Torres, 2016). Cyberwar may also affect the other side’s critical infrastructure or rewrite the goal functions of the other side’s AI, which could be a bad outcome.

# 6. Effects of the militarization drive on AI’s values

## 6.1. Value drift towards instrumental goal

Some authors suggest the idea of orthogonality between AI goals and capabilities (Bostrom, 2014). However, the idea of basic AI drives is an example of the convergence of goals and capability, because any goal will create some set of subgoals, and these subgoals will require capabilities in turn. Available capabilities are cheap and tested instruments of problem-solving, so they will affect the ways the system will act. The capabilities may even have their own self-preservation drives. A good example of this is the military-industrial complex in nation states, which may try lobbying the government to increase military action. Military AI will be more effective in violence than in negotiation, and it will likely choose violence as its preferred problem-solving method.

The AI could get stuck in the militarization and never disarm. This means that AI may never return to its initial beneficial goal, as it will spend most of its available resources on preparing for future war. This happened with the Soviet Union, which invested a prodigious amount of resources in the military, rather than its putative priority of workers’ wellbeing.

In other words, the AI may never return to its main goal, as there will be other possible or imaginary enemies. It could have wars—or prepare for such wars—with its own copies, or with hypothetical aliens. This could be presented in a rather rational way: if another civilization exists somewhere in the universe at an unknown distance, it would be rational to prepare for a conflict with it, as the winner will be the one who is better prepared.

Hopefully, the AI will be rational enough to be able to balance its hypothetical military preparations with actually doing good for people, and will not be a military maximizer. But this possibility should be taken into account during the AI’s programming.

A militarized AI will likely spend most available resources on building defensive and offensive infrastructure in space. This may include starting a wave of intelligence explosion to colonize as much cosmic space as possible. However, as the speed of light limits communication over long distances, space exploration will require the creation of additional military AIs with their own subgoals. There is a non-zero probability that such AIs may mutate and return to Earth as dangerous enemies. So, the second level of defense is needed against such rebellion, etc.

## 6.2. Recursive self-improving AI is a cyber weapon from the legal and military points of view

The creation of AI from the legal point of view is underexplored with only a few publications (Mancini, 2017), (Etzioni & Etzioni, 2016), (Maia Alexandre, 2017), and they do not touch superintelligence.

 Any publicly declared attempt to create a computer system able to take over the world and interfere with activity of critical infrastructure would be illegal from the internal point of view of a nation state. This would even be militarily provocative from the point of view of other countries, in the same way that creating a global doomsday machine may even more provocative than starting a nuclear war (Kahn, 1959). If such AI efforts are perceived as potentially successful, they may result in preventative cyber or even nuclear strikes by the rival nation state, even if the project is private. The leadership of such a project may understand this risk, and work in secret. This secrecy may have consequences on whether an effective AI safety solution is reached, both negative and positive.

 Other nation states, especially those that are weaker in AI, like Russia and to a lesser extent China, may understand that they will lose everything in the case of enemy AI creation. According to chess game-theory logic, the side which is losing its advantage must attack (Kasparov, 2008). So, there is a possibility of preemptive strike (perhaps nuclear or cyber) against AI facilities, chip-fabs, scientists, etc. from the weaker side.

Contemporary laws recognize cyberterrorism as an act of war (Shackelford, 2009), (Cohen, 2010). From a legal point of view, “superintelligence”—whether created by a hacker in his/her basement or by some other non-governmental organization—is a form of a computer malware (Pistono & Yampolskiy, 2016). This malware would be something like a polymorphic virus which is able to infect all computers in the world. If more sophisticated viruses than WannaCry were to appear, and have narrow AI, it could result in legislation targeted at the use of AI in malware. This could negatively affect scientists working on benevolent self-improving AI.

## 6.3. Negative PR effect for beneficial AI projects

A public acknowledgment that one is going to build a Global Beneficial AI, which will take power over the world, may be harmful to the project. Currently, MIRI excludes plans of Friendly AI creation from its public agenda and concentrates on providing AI alignment theory to other agents. However, this idea is intrinsic to the speculation about superintelligence, as it is clear from Bostrom’s writing that the one who gets the first AGI must use it to take over the world, as otherwise some other player will do it (Bostrom, 2014). An example of such bad PR is the media interpretation of so-called Roko’s Basilisk (Auerbach, 2014).

From a legal point of view (which could be different in different countries), any self-improving AI may be classified as a cyber weapon and a sophisticated computer virus; in this regard, its development may be regarded a cybercrime even before it starts. However, current laws do not prohibit the creation of computer viruses, only their dissemination.

## 6.4. Appearing of the AI control technology selects people who would like to use AI for world takeover

Not everybody wants to take the risk of creating potentially dangerous technology, but there are always will be people who are willing. Overconfidence resulting from previous success in gaining a leading role in such a project may increase risk-taking (Krueger & Dickson, 1994), (Kahneman & Lovallo, 1993). Such risk-hungry people are likely motivated by the expected larger payoff (Acharya & Naqvi, 2012), and in our case, such a payoff is likely world power. However, if no known ways to control AI exist, even a risk-hungry rational agent will postpone it use.

Selection effects result in the likelihood that the first AI will be aligned not with typical human values, but with the values of an unusual person or group of people. This could negatively affect the chances that the AI will be benevolent. If a person starts the first self-improving AI, this provides evidence about this person’s mindset. S/he is probably risk-prone, power hungry, and wants to use superintelligence to take over the world (perhaps with goals which s/he thinks are benevolent, but s/he does not care if others agree). So, if the first AI is aligned with its creator, it is likely aligned with a very special set of goals—which are themselves dangerous—but not with the general human set of goals.

This increases total risks, first, because the AI will receive a specific set of values from this person, which includes values of risk acceptance and world domination. Second, there is the chance that this person will not care as much about AI controllability and benevolence and will launch the unfinished project. The selection effect would likely come into effect only if there are many players and most of them declined to start self-improving processes (Bostrom, 2012).

# Conclusion. Peaceful alternatives to the creation of the military AI

We have shown that even the most beneficial and completely aligned AI may result in a global catastrophe, because of its need to take over the world and the accompanying militarization drive.

Recently, it has often been said that if we are able to solve the value alignment problem, we will solve AI safety (Russell, 2017). But the militarization trend shows that it is likely not so, as owners of perfectly aligned—with their goals—AI will probably still use it for militarization in an attempt for world domination.

If one AI refuses to take over the world, another AI may do it soon after; an AI-driven attempt to take over the world may be inevitable. Hence, creating military AI is a convergent drive of any course of AI development. This drive may never cease, as there will likely always be other potential threats, like possible aliens or mutiny of another AI. If several superintelligent AIs share the world, they could wage AI wars.

This means that we should search for other ways to achieve global coordination in the AI age, which does not include violent global AI takeover.

There are a few alternatives:

* Not to create AI at all, a decision enforced by global bans and restrictions.
* Create a non-self-improving AI nanny (Goertzel, 2012) as an international project. An AI nanny, as it was envisioned by Goertzel, is a limited and internationally controlled superintelligence which prevents the appearance of the other dangerous AIs and also solves many important problems for humanity.
* Create many AIs, so they will balance each other; this is in line with the ideas of Open AI (Brockman & Sutskever, 2015). The idea is that if there are thousands or millions of different AI systems, none of them will have an advantage over the others.
* Create AIs with robust motivational structure, that is, AIs which do not update their goal system or do not create new subgoals, will not form dangerous convergent goal behavior. This solution is local, as other AIs may gain an advantage by ignoring this restriction.

There is growing interest in the risks from military autonomous weapons, and another large field concerning only the risks of superintelligent AI. Exploration of the militarization trend of self-improving AI could build a bridge between these two important fields of AI safety.
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