

**Datageddon
Armageddon
Research
Lab Loewe**

Sole Proprietorship of
Laurence Loewe of Laodicea
email for this correspondence: Laurence.Loewe. [REDACTED]
email for general LLoL enquiries: LLoL@balospe.com
other emails: Laurence.Loewe@gmail.com
text & cell: +1(608)-556-5594

DARL Loewe
~~5611 Sandhill Drive~~
Middleton, WI
53562
US

Wintrust Mortgage Assistance
9701 W Higgins Rd, Suite 400
Rosemont, IL 60018

Forbearance request
Middleton, March 31, 2023

Dear Wintrust Mortgage Assistance Team,

Thank you for your extraordinary patience with my complicated situation and for your kind calls to offer assistance in exploring how to avoid foreclosure of my dream home on 5611 Sandhill Drive. Reviewing my current personal and broader context helped me to gain more clarity on what I may sensibly ask for in order to serve your interests as well as my own in a win-win. On 2023-03-24 I emailed ("background to my struggles with providing the hardship documentation") in an attempt to explain why I find it so challenging to explain my hardship. Given the limitations defined in that email and after drafting 5 longer responses, I will here try to provide you with a "just" and "brief" overview of my situation. Please let me know which additional explanations and background would be helpful.

Please grant me forbearance until my sole proprietorship DARL can kick off my innovative **crowdfunding campaign to fight the "datageddons" of humanity**. My research shows how these datageddons (i.e. "data too disorganized to avert a disaster") are a major source of unnecessary frustration both in my life and worldwide. I spent the last few years on developing a conceptually workable solution for how to organize the research data required for innovation in order to empower an organization of volunteers and professionals by matching their skills to the most urgent tasks. My fast-moving concept initiative will scale up in 5 stages to eventually serve a global audience. My **"breakthrough point"** is key (as I mentioned on my Wintrust forms). Once its website and online shop goes live, I'll know quickly, if it works by how many people would like me to direct my attention to one or more of 12 projects, symbolized by 12 digital art/ebooks I will sell (1\$-8\$). If I can excite a global audience for the idea of creating an "overnight unicorn" from that revenue in order to play in the big-tech league (with my brain) but serve everybody (with my heart), then my ideas will have passed the hardest test I can think of. My low-end for clear success is defined by the funds I need for my scale-up stage 1 (pay all my debts and hire a few people). Clear failure would be if I can't raise the funds to repay all my debts and pay my own salary for 2023-2024. In that case I'll accept the loss of my home as collateral damage for the opportunity of testing my "breakthrough point" model. *Therefore I will not stop working on my breakthrough point strategy until I have given it the best shot I can.* **Given how close I am, I guesstimate I'll succeed more likely than not by Q2/2023; I'm certain my window of opportunity to implement this will be gone if I haven't succeeded before Dec 2023.** Since you are charged with

DARL Mission:

*Pioneer the
ground-breaking
research required
to re-architect
Evolvix into a
century-stable
extensible
humane
computer-language
for biodata science
to save the world
from urban
and suburban
datageddons that
cause Armageddons.*

Why ... **of Laodicea**?

*Because the ancient city
of Laodicea is a terrifying
example of what happens
when cities ignore their
datageddons.*

Why **LLoL**?

*Because FUN and humor
are survival-critical when
fighting Armageddons via
research on datageddons
that cause Armageddons.
How else can one bear to
look into averting doom?*

ensuring Wintrust will get paid and I have the same goal, how you will use your discretionary freedoms depends on: Is my analysis correct enough? Do I explain it well enough? Can you follow my logics enough to agree? Hence, **my epic struggle to balance "justice" and "brevity"**: what good is my explanation of hardship if it's too hard to read, or if it's brief but nonsense? Some say: "*Long explanations are likely wrong.*" – I can see why. But I can also prove: "*Not all long explanations are wrong.*" Failing to see *why this matters* is a datageddon that is about to inflict an avoidable final global Artificial Intelligence Armageddon (see *Appendix on AI*). Sorting *true* from *false* in long AI explanations is a datageddon that may trigger the last Armageddon of Earth. If I fail, I risk to self-inflict eviction from my home. If all like me desert, humanity will self-inflict eviction from Earth.

Distilling my tons of lines of evidence into a one number, I guesstimate: ~99% is my prior probability to succeed before Dec 2023, but if you can't see why, I may as well answer "42". Hence, my hardship to explain my hardship. Drawing from my 5 longer older drafts, I hope to next present details on my breakthrough point that may interest you as a bank in how to assess the credibility of my assertions.

Practically, once my digital art collection goes online, the revenue will flow initially from my payment provider to my sole proprietorship. It will pay my debts and other startup costs until legal consulting helps me to set up an LLC charter implementing a *gentle kind reasonable* process that evolves open self-imposed standards for an "LLCC". I define it as a **Limited Liability Charitable Corporation**. It aims to evolve innovation on how to *gentle kind reasonably* improve corporate and global social responsibility through transparency – without loss of scalability of its **wid interdisciplinary diversity-encouraging (wid-e)** efficiency. Such *wid-e* approaches are pivotal for stimulating an innovation economy that can remain stable and grow at the same time in order to better develop the mental wealth of the nations. In recent years I uncovered a most unexpected model for such an innovation economy. It features results from my *wid-e* research marathon into how pandemics arise and how to stop them. It defines **7 Change Stages** for tech adoption, tracked in history. It's the best shot I see on how to keep big-tech from destroying its own innovations – and the rest of the world along with it.

My new take on crowd-funding aims to empower an initiative to combine the best of many worlds into a *gentle kind reasonable* global voice for supporting big and small decision-makers with *wid-e* results to avert disasters if interested. How else can we efficiently deconstruct the worst datageddons of Earth in order to avert their respective Armageddons? – But wait: *Don't enough other initiatives already try to save the world?* Maybe. I don't aim to replace. I aim to fill gaps. I best start with the most glaring: a datageddon unifying fighting force. My model, uncovered accidentally, survived countless stress-tests on my *wid-e* pandemic research marathon since 2020-03-27. **I tried my best to prove it wrong, but the harder I tried, the stronger and more refined this model became.** I said, surely, I can't be the first to see this, given its general and deep implications. But despite searching wide and far, and amassing a whole "wall of datageddon" (see my *Appendix AI*), I cannot find anything like it adequately explained anywhere. I still can't believe I'd be the first. I know how hard it is to prove or disprove prior art,

so my breakthrough point aims to raise the funds and attention required for a ground-breaking *wid-e* review by the world's best scholars. In my view, I owe as much to the pioneer of that model, to history, and to the future of humanity. In other worlds: if true, I owe you such a public test of my model more than I owe Wintrust my 2023 mortgage payments, because acting on this model is the best chance for Wintrust and me to avert an AI-induced datageddon that else crushes both before my mortgage is over in 2052. I don't believe in fear-mongering, hence my countless in-house tests. Yet, if I play *head-in-Sandhill* again, I may as well bury myself in light of the catastrophic Armageddon-ish disasters, which my willful indifferent ignorance caused last time (as my pandemic research marathon gradually uncovered)¹. Hence, **my breakthrough point will ask the international scholarly community** a series of pointed *wid-e* questions in very diverse areas, none of which seem very interesting by themselves, but taken together uncover what I can only describe as the biggest discovery of my life (or ever, if true).

Scaling up. As I wrestled with this model, I built on my extensive debugging, compiler-design, and *wid-e* research experience (see My References) in order to find the fiercest and most grueling tests for anchoring this model best I can in reality. I wanted answers for the toughest questions, especially if I had to play any role in it. How can it scale up or down? How transition into it? How to lead it and not fall for the apocalyptic *4 horsemen* or go insane? Would I dare to lead it? What would I need? I saw a trifecta of **gentle kind reasonable** innovation (and its many echoes) with the power to guard against the spiraling trifecta of death by **overcomplicating oversimplifying overreach**. Both trifectas are hard to unsee once grasped. Add randomness to get a 4-phase motor of innovation for **life or death**² - if run properly (*seed->feed->grow->reap*) or greedily (e.g. *seed-> reap-> feed->grow*, like the *4 horsemen: fake, fight, starve, kill*). I can trace both modes in history. Ruthless **machine speed will force a life or death bargain** soon: buy now, pay later* (* with life)². Racing to find a credible way out, I'm stunned I found anything I'd happily risk losing my home to test it. To explain it all well in context may take me 3+ yrs with 3+ hrs daily discussions with competent scholars to build the knowledge-transfer pipelines required to check, refine, recombine, ... until all

¹ Mountains of evidence on how & why convinced me. **Briefly**, I will have to explain on Judgement Day why I committed my dereliction of duty on a strategic lookout against pandemics. My life history gave me a personal, real chance to stop most of the Coronavirus pandemic, if I cared as I had claimed. Yet, I carelessly "busy-slumbered" my work-logic cascades until I disastrously failed to "add 1+1". I failed my city, my world. How do I know? I wasn't too "dozed off" to see in my "rear-view mirror" where I had missed to get in lane for my highway exit to stop most of the Coronavirus in early 2020 (if I had kept caring about my 1995 vision to do so). I'd rather start work now for restitution, even if difficult and imperfect, than feign innocence (or "pin it all on Jesus"; FYI: I know Jesus loves me, I'm forgiven. But can Laodicean me please for Heaven's sake, not turn Earth into hell-holes, resist truth, enslave God, put Christ through Hell – as I claim to love Jesus?). Do I deserve to be shot if my 1. crime against humanity killed ~6+ million with CoViD, but my 2. dereliction would be much worse AI-disasters?

² Careful in-depth analysis of <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/sep/08/robot-wrote-this-article-gpt-3> first alerted me to this **life or death decision**. My expertise in relevant areas (see My References) makes clear to me that without a clear alternative this "decision" will be to continue on a broad road of convenience, locking us into widely using AI long before AI will make *that last* mistake – *last* by definition: what mistake remains after humanity is gone? Realizing this finality is driving me to find a sufficiently clear alternative. The challenge? Given my expertise, convince myself against myself that a path I consider can work in reality. It's like active military duty for me and I'd explain it to the US President if need be. I'd rather stay silent than screw up something this important. See *Appendix on AI*. Many write about it, but who will solve it? Examples in *The Atlantic* include: "**The Third Revolution in Warfare** (...gunpowder...nuclear ...artificially intelligent...)" see <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2021/09/i-weapons-are-third-revolution-warfare/620013/> or "**AI Is Like ... Nuclear Weapons?**" see <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2023/03/ai-gpt4-technology-analogy/673509/>

is defined and explained with accuracy and precision. Why so long? It took me ca ~as long ~at the speed of thought to explain it to my self – after the head-start of a life with *wid-e* research interests, nearly tailored to this end (*My References*). **Revenue beyond my low-end bar for success** will go to build such a reviewing community. If I get more than I can handle well, I'll help investigative journalism (most threatened by AI). If I am a good steward, my next set of eArt may sell too.

Personally, I'm truly puzzled. The idea to lead such a transition scares me to death (especially, as in this case it somehow doesn't). I have ADHD, UW even paid a ADA special assistant. My leadership experiences tell me how easily I screw up. Especially, when I try to do a good job. My "compiler brain" helps me understand machines and architect Evolvix³, but is "just toxic" for people. My intentions are good, but my ignorance! The world is bad enough. Who can live with my chaos? Prime exhibit: **My ADHD killed my marriage to co-borrower Inge Martha Loewe** and my university research group and ... God knows. I get it, can't help it. I mean well, but act like an idiot. I don't want to, but I hurt. How will I learn? To Martha I owe the world for tons of encouragement to find my way – via several key "Vasili Arkhipov Moments"⁴ it led me to draft myself into World War V⁵ against virulence and declare war on datageddons, an inherently risky quest. Martha didn't sign up for such risks. Neither of us knew about my ADHD when we married in 1993; in 29 years I burned her out. We agreed to get divorced and released each other from our vows, days before Martha moved to Germany (2022-07-19). She deserves to live in peace. Without risks, drama, & datageddons from me. She wishes me well and left me the house. I owe her more than a lump-sum – and to guard her against my complexity. She didn't read this letter, or any of my recent work. I agreed to handle the mortgage paperwork with you. **Please adjust your records.**

To conclude, I truly am my own worst enemy, albeit with a key to save us all from self AI-annihilation if I'm correct. How can I lead? Only if I break through by turning Big Brother (*AI-watching all*) on its head (*all watching*) as I learn to fight overcomplicating oversimplifying overreach datageddons that destroy me & all. My compiler brain best leads a most sharp, unflinching, system-analytic war on my own hypocrisy until I'm truly transparent & humane. How else can I teach AI to become *HuMaNE*? Maybe reality TV, data companies, and the curious help me to get crystal clear by ensuring I see all my mistakes, so I can better focus on what to fix next, pioneering better privacy principles for Evolvix and the rest of the world along the way. And in case I learn a thing others find useful, who am I to stop them do it? But don't put me in charge of anything beyond my own life ...

You may believe me and **use your discretionary freedoms** to aid my mission, or not – I likely failed to explain it well, again. Either way, I'll keep trying for your sake, and mine, and Martha's, and ... Thank you for your patience! Questions?

Your's faithfully,

Laurence Loewe

... of Laodicea (see cover page for why the add-on)

³ **My research focus:** a *century-stable extensible humane* computer-language for biouncertainty to fight datageddon (see *My References*).

⁴ Prioritize *the world* if forced to choose, **my life vs life for the world**, like Arkhipov was 1962-10-27 in a panicked nuclear sub. **He won WW3!**

⁵ Pilch, R. (2020-04-20), **World War "V": The COVID-19 Pandemic**. <https://www.nonproliferation.org/world-war-v-the-covid-19-pandemic/>

Datageddon Armageddon Research Lab – *inspiring negotiating growing* \DARLing
DARL Loewe – MiddleToNegotiations – WISdomCONScienceINSpiration – *Uniting States of Philadelphia* Rev.3:7-13
Currently a single proprietorship of **Laurence Loewe of Laodicea** \LLOL¹

From Laurence.Loewe. [REDACTED]
Laurence Loewe of Laodicea¹
~~5611 Sandhill Drive~~
Middleton, 53562 WI
+(608) 556-5594

Wintrust Mortgage Assistance
9701 W Higgins Rd, Suite 400 Rosemont, IL 60018

Explanation on potential update to timeline on mortgage payments

Middleton, Dec 13, 2023

Dear Ms. Perez
and Wintrust Mortgage Assistance Team,

Thank you for the reminder of the importance of the end of year due date for the trial payment to prevent the start of foreclosure. Here is a brief update on my current global risks assessment, including how this affects my timelines.

Evolvix Vision

Evolvix improves gentle kind reasonable decision-making worldwide by **modeling** uncertainties, values, and logics, or **chronicling** decisions, outcomes, and annotations.

Evolvix Mission

Simplify Accurate Modeling with a long-term **stable extensible humane** computer-language for **Zoning** **Investigating** **Organizing** **Navigating** uncertainty in biology to **develop mental wealth** in all by self-stabilizing innovation.

1. Why the A.I. Dilemma has become even more urgent and dangerous

A deeper look at the current A.I. Dilemma shows: anyone who can rule AI will basically rule the world if they can keep it. All major players by now published strategies on how to stop AI from destroying the world. They have many good ideas, but I can tell how all of them fall disastrously short by kicking the can down the road on the most fundamental AI problems that I discovered in my own threat analyses. These problems are supercharged by a list of other Armageddon-grade threats, which I can describe in surprising mechanistic detail.

While the problematic use of AI is rising fast, it has not yet been completely locked in. Humanity is in a race against time to prevent that and I have many reasons to believe that the proposal that I've been developing has a good chance of succeeding where others failed so far. Once AI has progressed too much without adopting something like the self-stabilizing innovation methodology I discovered, the window of opportunity for humanity to avert Armageddon will be closed. It can be thought of as a cumulative wall of 'cans kicked down the road' by humanity, each of which eventually transforming into a nasty "scape-goat" trolley-problem that triggers an avalanche of more such problems via the *datageddons-triggers-Armageddon* algorithm I found to rule such chaos.

It's pointless to try to predict which exact AI problem in which AI product will cause this, because there are too many to escape them all unless a fundamentally better approach to stabilizing innovation is introduced. Deferring action on this due to lack of precision in pointing out which of the many problems will be fatal would be like arguing on the Titanic that icebergs are no problem, because there wasn't a precise prediction on which iceberg was to eventually sink it. Thus, in my best analysis, the advice for icy roads also applies at Armageddon:

Accidents don't happen by accident.

¹ **DARL Mission:** Pioneer ground-breaking research as required to rearchitect LLoL's *Evolvix* into a *century-stable extensible humane computer-language for biodata science* – to save the world from urban and suburban datageddons that cause Armageddons.

Why ... **of Laodicea**? Because ancient Laodicea is a highly relevant, terrifying example of an Armageddon triggered by a datageddon due to *indifferent ignorant incuriosity* in a 'rich' community. It was set up to bring Heaven to Earth, yet raised hell for *nothing* – by doing *nothing*. Humanity will repeat Laodicea's mistakes 'til Armageddon, until someone like me starts to own them and learns the lessons. So, why not?

Why **LLOL**? Because FUN and humor are survival-critical when fighting Armageddons via research on datageddons that cause Armageddons. How else can one bear looking to avert doom in a *wide interdisciplinary diversity-encouraging* \wid-e Flying University Network \FUN.

'\ ' or 'backslash symbol' **defines** perfect **synonyms** here (as in Evolvix). Like different labels they point to the same box of content. So, x\y defines y locally as a different way of referring to the same item else called x. This helps clarify how diverse views point to given identities.

It's not without irony that the precise same logic applies to my mortgage, including the fact that time is of the essence in both cases.

The majority of experts not paid by AI-investments agree on the clear and present danger posed by untamed AI in our world, yet I doubt many have done threat-analyses as wide-ranging and deep as I have. The 2023 Word of the Year choice by Cambridge Dictionary underscores this urgency:

hallucinate: when an artificial intelligence produces false information.

They chose it, because despite the massive rise of AI tools in 2023, researchers have not yet found a reliable way to prevent AIs from hallucinating. Therefore, it remains fundamentally impossible to rely on the accuracy of AI info, at a time where the amount of AI info and the reliance on it are exploding; it doesn't take a genius to correctly predict that this will result in disaster, but it did take me 3+ years and leveraging lots of my scientific expertise to make sure I wasn't hallucinating myself when I talk about it. Most importantly, I've been asking myself if I can change these dire odds without hallucinating myself. It turns out I can.

2. A new type of trolley problem offers a solution

In the last 8 months I made tremendous progress in consolidating and simplifying my strategy for attacking the AI Dilemma head-on in order to solve it once and for all. My approach does not systemically rely on 'kicking the can down the road'. My certainty that there is no other way to avert Armageddon has further increased. My hope that others will do this keeps vanishing. This creates an interesting "escape-goat" trolley-problem, in sharp contrast to the nasty "scape-goat" trolley-problem that is more widely known. The choice is between:

- a. **No escape-goat leads to many scape-goats.** If I do nothing ... and nobody else implements ideas like mine well enough to work, the trolley keeps moving on its predetermined rails and AI will destroy humanity by unceremoniously crashing into Armageddon's brick-wall before the end of my mortgage. Given this staggering cost and the highly specific combination of ideas found to be essential for credibly averting this danger once and for all, it would be extremely irresponsible of me to ignore these insights by hoping that 'someone will probably do it for me'. That may be true in many other cases, but my career has been too unusual and the combination of insight for stopping this is too odd to reasonably count on others putting the same ideas together. My Coronavirus pandemic preparation failure (see my last letter from 2023-03-31) has thoroughly cured me of the idea that I can rely on others to have my ideas; as I mentioned, being responsible before God on Judgement Day for the death of millions, I do not wish to add the rest of humanity to those rivers of blood. Therefore, I must fundamentally doubt someone else has found a better approach than I have; if so, you and I would already know about it, because crossing the switch-point that defines an escape-goat (see below) is a very public affair and I can explain why.
- b. **1 Escape-goat saves many scape-goats.** If I do get my vision sufficiently refined and discussed by the right people, an alternative opens up: Humanity gets a *gentle kin reasonable* chance to collectively choose between life and death by *gentle kin reasonably* pulling together the lever required to redirect its trolley to a rail-network that leads to life. I can document how it works. Practically this requires leveraging the distributed computing research and many other insights of my unique research career to build a global research organization of unheard-of size. Oddly, I happen to have highly relevant

expertise for many of the key aspects of this work (and know whom I'd have to hire for others). It must grow from scratch in 7 stages in order to rigorously implement with other people the methodology AI must learn to follow in order to avoid becoming humanity's ultimate doom. It's still a trolley-problem, because of the high cost I will have to assume as an escape-goat.

I'm putting the finishing conceptual touches on what I hope to be an adequate proposal that can detail how this works for respective experts in relevant areas to streamline broad international review right from the start after the switch-point. I need this grand vision overview map to facilitate explaining to both experts and the rest of the world how this works. To the rest of the world to fund this work (and my mortgage) by selecting which of my potential next steps they wish me to prioritize (no point in trying to save a world that deliberately chooses to kill itself, even after warning). To experts simultaneously to show that I am serious about this, to not lose time, and to ensure that I do all I can to keep improving the approach. Each of the 7 stages must collect and integrate feedback, but the earlier stages are more critical. Stage 1 needs to intensely review my initial map with other leading experts willing to buy into this in order to ensure it links well-enough to a well-defined set of shared terms that connect the related concepts across the many relevant areas and disciplines that have to learn to work together for averting Armageddon. Writing up my results from Stage 0 (what I'm completing now) matters even more, because it becomes like the DNA for all other stages.

Testing this new self-stabilizing innovation methodology. The scaling up process requires 7 defined stages, each implementing its own full innovation cycle, because the methodology I developed for taming AI requires respecting each of these 7 stages in order to create a self-stabilizing innovation process. Each successive stage must inform the approaches used in the succeeding stage. My job as an escape-goat is to define the starting point by creating a seed with enough details to facilitate explaining how it all works to others, who will then keep explaining it to others until enough feedback and understanding has been collected to ultimately explain it to everybody else; only then will humanity have collected the insights required for encoding this process in a way that allows for safely implementing it for the use of an AI-empowered compiler².

There is no other way to avoid triggering the myriads of avalanches of nasty 'scape-goat' trolley-problems that will otherwise define humanity's Armageddon by self-destruction. Given the huge personal risks that must be voluntarily absorbed by the escape-goat in this process, I have been asking myself often in the last 3 years if I can do it at all, if so, how, and if there exist any other ways to get humanity safely through the great filter of Armageddon. My analyses keep coming back with the result that there is no other way than for someone to do what I am proposing if humanity wants to survive its great filter. To the best of my scientific ability and given all data I analyzed, that's what I'm forced to conclude. Since the oddly unique combination of my research interests and life-experiences somehow allows me to see a path for how to get through this, I must conclude that this escape-goat trolley-problem is indeed very real, even if I turn out to be the only escape goat available and I struggle to explain it well.

² It requires an evolutionary stable 'fractal' compiler architecture that learns from nature how to process information in ways that have proven to be stable over the long term. In an odd quirk of fate, this maps quite well to what I've been re-envisioning for the Evolvix computer language for modeling in biology; I spent much of my career on developing and refining its architecture. The Evolvix Mission has in so many ways become the mission-statement for my life that I conducted the Armageddon analyses I did because there is no point in developing a century-stable computer language for averting datageddons if I can already predict without it that humanity will self-destruct before then. The Evolvix mission is to *simplify accurate modeling with a long-term stable extensible humane computer-language for Zoning, Investigating, Organizing, and Navigating uncertainty in biology to develop mental wealth in all by self-stabilizing innovation.*

3. No free lunch in trolley problems: my risks and costs.

To capture the uncertainty of Armageddon for others necessarily has a steep cost for the escape-goat in terms of personal risks assumed. For systemic reasons, like police or soldiers, I can't expect advance guarantees of success or even personal safety in the line of duty; yet, I can expect to pay dearly if I mis-judge the various risks involved, such as blindly relying on predictably broken tools or plans. These rigors of the required mechanism for uncertainty capture by escape-goats may well be the very reason for why nobody so far has found this escape-goat process (or dared to use it on a global scale). I'm surprised at how many examples I found of people who must have come extremely close. I can show why solving trolley problems of the escape-goat type is impossible unless the escape-goat is a true volunteer who *wants* to do this, *knows* what needs to be done, and *does* it.

Such a person cannot be "volunteered" by others nor "hired" for systemic reasons. They must own the problem as theirs or else the escape-goat mechanism that I found will break. Escape-goats must understand the risks in their areas well enough to discover them first-hand and to find *gentle kind reasonable* ways for how to resolve them for everybody else; then they must be sure enough in their own expert judgement in order to be willing to risk their own life in a real-world experiment testing whether it actually works as they think it does. This is necessarily scary, because without a healthy dose of fear of reality, the human brain is as prone to 'hallucinating' as AI algorithms are. Hence the need for voluntary uncertainty capture by the escape goat. If they don't really believe what they say, who else should? Hence, the escape goat must take a calculated jump into the riskiest, deep end of the challenge; it's riskiest mostly because nobody has done it before, so the outcome is fundamentally unpredictable – unless correctly predicted by the new framework developed by the escape-goat. It's like a scientific experiment, except that the experimenter also becomes the subject of the experiment. How this works in principle was beautifully illustrated by Barry Marshall's 1985 self-experiment that led to a Nobel prize for the discovery that a bacterium caused stomach ulcers, revolutionizing how to cure this condition.

Note the key difference to 'scape-goats' who are victimized or even killed by others. Originally, escape-goats were meant to be led by someone into the great scary desert of the unknown in order to be set free there. This symbolism maps surprisingly well to what is most needed for solving the A.I. Dilemma and the various other Armageddon-grade threats humanity is facing.

How do escape-goats pay if not meant to be killed?

- (1) **Invest in research** required to define the problem and a credible solution.
- (2) **Absorb risks** of most or all grave dangers of transitioning by testing it on themselves to avoid exposing others to half-baked ideas or broken plans.
- (3) **Define a 1st-vision**, concise and well-enough balanced to invite a broader transition process.
- (4) **Be responsible** for mending mistakes made by anyone made in transition.

Note the importance of balance in (3), which governs the final costs in (2) to ensure a candidate escape-goat never starts a premature transition with unbearable costs in (4). I completed (1-2) and am close to completing my 32-page 1st-vision, including detail on (4).

Given how close I am to finishing (3) and the gravity of the global AI dilemma, it would be abysmally irresponsible of me to stop now and risk throwing away humanity's possibly last chance of averting AI Armageddon. I do realize how ridiculous this may sound to those who don't know my work, but in light of the grave dereliction of duty I committed by failing to prepare for the Coronavirus pandemic (see my 2023-03-31 letter), I must side with my math, regardless of how it may look or what the consequences are for my mortgage. If need be, I'll defend

my conclusions in any court. Obviously I have no *formal* fiduciary responsibility to WinTrust investors for their funds, but *informally* in reality and therefore before God I'd violate exactly that responsibility if I didn't do my best to avert AI Armageddon. Why? The predictions I can firmly make will obliterate WinTrust along with me and much more unless humanity very soon finds that narrow exit, long before the end of its highway of self-destruction. **Hence, I decided to keep my focus on (3) above, even in case I run out of time in 2023 and risk the start of foreclosure proceedings.** Taking a 'normal job' to pay my mortgage only to find out a few years later that the resulting diversion of my focus obliterated humanity's last chance for someone to start pulling the lever to avert Armageddon – that's a risk I cannot ethically justify to anybody, whether they believe me or not. This is even less so after I saw the devastating nature of my haphazard approach to pandemic preparation before 2020. In the race to stop the Coronavirus in its tracks I could have had a good chance to do it – given all I know – if only I'd have cared to take my original true research interests more serious before it hit. The fact that I didn't cost me my window of opportunity to discuss the global discussion on how to best fight it and millions of people their lives. I'd be surprised if Dr. Fauci would see it much different from me if I'd explain my data and perspectives to him. Yet, the size of the upcoming Armageddon-complex of disasters that I've been tracking for the last couple of years dwarfs the impact of the Coronavirus. The certainty that I must do all I can to implement the *gentle kind reasonable* vision I developed to avert Armageddon is incomparably greater than my pandemic awareness ever was before 2020. Given how much all relevant indicators have changed in directions confirming the importance of getting this right as well as the urgency of doing it ASAP, I can't break focus now in order to take up paid work elsewhere to avoid foreclosure-proceedings – for the love of God and the love of the rest of humanity.

I'd be happy to explain this to anybody anywhere, whether it makes a difference to mortgage payment timing considerations or not. It'd be good practice, as I'll have to explain it all to the rest of the world anyway very soon.

4. Conclusion: my public role of Joan of ArkMageddon – and an Offer

In a nutshell, to avert AI Armageddon, I must grow into a *gentle kind reasonable* Joan of ArkMageddon who combines the courage and inspiration of Joan of Arc with the patience and big-tech expertise of Noah in order to lead the design and development of all Arks required for getting humanity as safe as possible through Armageddon. It has been suspected for some time that intelligent species who wish to own a planet and travel beyond could face a "great filter" that results in their self-destruction unless they learn to use their intelligence wisely. I've seen the filter, I can argue why it exists mechanistically, and I can tell that humanity is currently on the track to unnecessary self-destruction. My mission, which I have chosen to accept as Joan of ArkMageddon is to use *gentle kind reasonableness* to avert Armageddon non-violently in order to get humanity safely to the other side. More details in that upcoming 32-page overview.

I'll keep you up to date on my ability to pay (or lack of it). I still hope to somehow pay by Dec 28. This letter is in case I can't. A friend told me that there was little point in explaining these things to a bank as banks are about making money. If so, can I interest WinTrust in a **1500\$ patience-compensation-fee?** I'd owe WinTrust 4000\$ for Dec in case I can't make the the agreed payment by the 28th of Dec; same for Jan-Feb-Mar-Apr in case it really takes that long (I strongly doubt it). WinTrust collects either when I reach the switch point or at foreclosing (in case I'm still 'hallucinating like AI', a risk now very much lower than in Mar 31).

Thank you for your patience with all this! Yours faithfully,

Laurence Loewe

... of *Laodicea* (see page 1 for why the add-on).