

You Might Be Right - Artificial Intelligence - Transcript

Michael Kratsios: What's really been special about working in the AI policy world over the last few years has been how truly bipartisan it's been. I think this handover from one administration to the next, over three successive administrations, has been pretty powerful to watch. We're all rowing in the same direction, to drive American leadership in AI.

Marianne Wanamaker: Welcome to "You Might Be Right," a place for civil conversations about tough topics brought to you by the Baker School of Public Policy and Public Affairs at the University of Tennessee, with funding support from members of our Producer Circle. To learn more about how you can support our work, visit youmightberight.org.

The world is several months into an artificial intelligence revolution. In today's episode, former Tennessee Governors Bill Haslam and Phil Bredesen focus on AI technology and how it is evolving. The Governors speak with Michael Kratsios, former Chief Technology Officer for the United States, asking him whether AI has been as disruptive as we thought it might be a year ago, what are the most compelling use cases, and is America doing what we need to do to be the global leader in the technology of tomorrow.

Phil Bredesen: Well, Bill, I think this is the first repeat we've had of a subject during the podcast here.

Bill Haslam: And a worthy topic for it.

Phil Bredesen: And a worthy topic, a lot of stuff going on. Not much more important going on in the economics world these days, than the implications of AI.

Bill Haslam: I think the implications for how it's used and for what happens for businesses, individuals, countries that don't take advantage of it.

Phil Bredesen: Right.

Bill Haslam: I think given his prior and his current role, he's going to have some great insight for us.

Phil Bredesen: Looking forward to it. It should be good.

Bill Haslam: Phil, really excited to have our guest, not only for his background, but for the topic he's talking about. Michael Kratsios is currently the managing director of Scale AI, a San Francisco based firm, which accelerates the development of AI applications. Prior to that, he had a fairly important job. He was the Chief Technology Officer of the United States, and Undersecretary of Defense for Research and Engineering. He had that role, really as two critical things happened. He led the nation's first AI strategy. He helped double federal AI and quantum research spending. And he developed the first in the world regulatory principles to govern AI

development. Then during COVID, he helped launch our effort to use supercomputers to leverage the fight against COVID. He is a native of South Carolina. His family immigrated there, I don't know if directly there, but his family immigrated from Greece. We're really thrilled to have him on the show.

Michael, thanks so much for joining us.

Michael Kratsios: Thank you guys so much. Delighted to be here.

Phil Bredezen: Let me start out, Michael. This is the first occasion we've had to repeat a topic. About a year ago, we did one, a session on AI. This is probably as rapidly changing field as anything out there in the world right now. I want to just start out with saying if we gave people a little bit of a baseline a year ago, talk to us a little bit about what's happened in the past year. What are the most recent things that are going on that are impacting this field and that people should be aware of?

Michael Kratsios: Absolutely. Yeah. I think after ChatGPT came out, there was this dramatic revolution, both in the consumer use of artificial intelligence for the first time, so you saw Americans be able to touch, feel, and experience artificial intelligence themselves. That changed the tone dramatically in Washington on how regulators and legislators should be thinking about artificial intelligence.

I think the update is when this first started, there was this big swing, in at least the policy landscape, for a lot of the legislative community to be interested in these big, bold ideas about maybe new large regulatory agencies that could oversee AI. There were some who testified about the potential creation of an International Atomic Energy Agency equivalent for AI. But what's been amazing to watch over time is that more and more that legislators start to digest what this technology was about, the tone has changed a little bit. We're starting to see much more bipartisan focus on more use case, sector specific approaches to regulating AI. I think everyone's been educated up a bit, but the technology is still dramatically improving.

Bill Haslam: Michael, one of the things we're trying to do with this podcast is actually encourage bipartisan thinking on big issues, so I guess intriguing to me when you said that. If you got to be the czar of policy, I guess you in some ways were, but if you got to help pass a message to political leaders about why this is bigger than a red versus blue issue in terms of how we look at it, what would your message be?

Michael Kratsios: I think the first thing I would say, and probably most important of all, is that this is a technology that is truly going to be touching and impacting every single American. In some ways, there are very few issues that rise to that level. If you are the President of the United States, and you're thinking about, "What are the most important things that are impacting everyone in the country?" Artificial intelligence is moving rapidly up the list to something there. It's important that solutions are found where, collectively, Americans are comfortable with this technology, and we're positioning the United States to maintain its long term leadership in this

particular field.

I think the second piece is one that I think requires a lot of attention and focus because our adversaries, and many of our allies, are all rapidly trying to catch up with the U.S. It's critical that we put the country in a position where we continue to lead the world.

Phil Bredezen: A lot of the discussion of AI right now is around very large deployments of it. The ChatGPT, and the imaging stuff, and so on. Yet, I suspect that things that will touch individual Americans may be happening at a much more granular level. In both Bill's and my adult lifetime, computer technology came of age and has transformed things in different way. But some things, it's transformed to be just very simple kinds of businesses. McDonald's wouldn't be the McDonald's it is today without the technology that they have.

What are some areas that may be ordinary, prosaic things we're used to seeing, but have the potential to be really transformed by the application of AI into something different?

Michael Kratsios: Yeah. The one that I think could be the most impacting, and one that excites me the most, and that I'm most optimistic about is certainly in the world of healthcare and precision medicine. The idea that every disease that every person has should be treated the exact same way, no matter where you're from, what age you are, who you are. You can quickly start to understand that, if you can use or harness this technology in a way to create precise ways to treat a lot of diseases, it can fundamentally change the way people interact with medicine. When you're diagnosed with something it's not just, "This is the standard course, take it." It will be some version of that that's customized to you based on who you are.

I think that's an example of something that, you're going to wake up in 20 years, and it's going to be a very different approach to the way you take yourself and your family.

Bill Haslam: Michael, following up on that. Like I said, one of us are Republican, one's a Democrat, but we're both, I'd say, fairly fiscally conservative. We are concerned about particularly the impact of skyrocketing healthcare costs on the federal budget, as well as states' budgets. Do you see hope there? Can AI also be part of controlling— I always said, my fear is the United States' government is getting ready to be a big healthcare insurance company with a small army attached to it. Can this technology help address cost and not just quality? Quality is critical, I'm not minimizing that.

Michael Kratsios: It can. I think AI, I think just released the latest version of the chart I'm sure you're very familiar with, that shows the rising costs of all sorts of things. Healthcare continued to be up and to the right and the most expensive of all from an inflation standpoint. My sense is it absolutely will. If you think about the cost drivers of what go into healthcare, a lot of it is just the logistics and the back office of being able to run a very large healthcare system that is treating over 300 million people. These are the types of efficiencies that AI can absolutely help with.

The other big thing is if you're treating people early and treating them well, most importantly they will be sick less. As we all know, the greatest cost drivers for healthcare are typically later in life, when you haven't been able to prevent something. Hopefully, this can drive much more preventative medicine, and ultimately drives costs overall down.

Phil Bredezen: When you start talking about healthcare, you also get into some ethical issues. If AI is being used, for example, to improve diagnosis and treatment programs, I think a legitimate critique is we don't know enough about what goes on between the input and the output to really have the confidence that this is something you should do to another human being. Even things like ChatGPT have well-known hallucinations, and frequently come up with very incorrect kinds of things as well.

Does that make it more difficult or impossible to use in something like healthcare?

Michael Kratsios: You're absolutely right. To me, I think one of the most important things that I advocate for on the Hill, it's something I think the government has a huge role to play, is in this category of work around the test and evaluation of these models. It is still an unsettled science on how you can actually test and evaluate these large language models. Organizations like NIST, at the Department of Commerce, and other standards agencies are the places where this fundamental, basic research needs to continue so that we're able to answer those very tough questions.

To your point, applying it specifically to healthcare, under our administration, the first ever AI-powered medical diagnostic was approved by the FDA. There was a tool for diabetic retinopathy that was approved by the FDA, where it can essentially assess your eye through an algorithm and tell you whether or not you likely have diabetic retinopathy, and you need to go see a doctor.

I think if you think about it, the agencies that continue to regulate all sorts of things, whether it be airplanes and drones, or healthcare, or medical diagnostics, as AI expands into those fields, those regulatory agencies need to be up to speed to be able to approve, and have comfort, and a level of confidence that what they are approving for use is up to snuff.

Bill Haslam: Well, I'm going to stop and ask you a more basic question. I noticed that your BA is in politics. It's not in computer engineering, or technology, et cetera. I think one of the fears so many folks have is if I'm not a techy type person, this is all just going to leave me further and further behind.

How did somebody with your background end up being the Chief Technology Officer of the United States of America?

Michael Kratsios: I have always been passionate about technology. I think one of the things I regret, I guess, is not getting an engineering degree as an undergrad. It's probably a lesson in life, and I tell a lot of folks that I mentor, that ultimately, the things that you're passionate about

are where you're ultimately going to end up, whether you want it or not. Your life is going to find a way there.

For me, I started my career in finance, ultimately I was working at essentially at venture capital firm, and we were investing in and advising technology companies. During that time, I think the more and more we thought about a lot of these investments, the more we realized that the analysis around regulations and the way that the government interacts with these startups became a much bigger part of our investment thesis. The firm I worked for before invested in places like SpaceX, Airbnb, Lyft, Spotify. These are all companies that had pretty significant regulatory headwinds.

I think to me, when I was thinking more about that, I was like, "Wait a second. We want to be the most innovative country in the world. We have to create a regulatory structure which can support, and encourage, and drive further innovation in the US, not do the opposite." So when the opportunity came up to actually do that work for government, I jumped on it. It was an experience of a lifetime.

Phil Bredesen: One of the things that concerns me a little bit is that, while we may end up doing what you're suggesting, which is putting the regulatory emphasis on very sector-specific kinds of things, there's pressure for the Congress to do something. I think particularly all these questions surrounding IP, intellectual property, are helping to drive some of that as well.

It worries me a little bit because, I guess it was a couple years ago, I remember watching some of the hearings in which they were talking to some of the tech gurus. Let's just say the sophistication of the Congress on these issues was not overwhelming. You worry about what would happen if the Congress feels like they needed to dive into this.

If you were in a position, somebody was saying just politically, "We need to do something to show we're in control of this kind of thing," what would you suggest? What is legislatable in this that would be useful?

Michael Kratsios: Yeah. To me, I think the first step goes back to something you mentioned a little bit earlier, around the test and evaluation of these models. But you can, as an agency, even be able to think about how you'd regulate an AI-powered that's within your jurisdiction, you have to have the tools to be able to do the assessment. The major, fundamental, scientific question of how do we evaluate these models is still an open question.

If you think about what does the U.S. Government do? It funds early stage, basic, pre-competitive research and development to amazing institutions, even like UT, to the tune of over \$150 billion a year. If you were a legislator, you should be saying, "Look, the U.S. needs to lead the world in how we test and evaluate these models." Once this test and evaluation regime is standardized, and it's promulgated by other standard agencies around the world, then it will make it much, much easier for our regulatory agencies to be able to do the very important safety analyses that are so critical for all Americans. That would be one thing.

I think the second thing, which we haven't really touched on a lot, is we have to develop and fund programs that support the use of artificial intelligence in our national security and defense. We know that our adversaries are investing at a level and at a velocity that is absolutely incredible. We know that, especially the CCP has an intense desire to meet where the U.S. is and surpass us in our ability. For us to be able to continually be able to project power and to be able to deter any action in the Pacific theater, we have to be a continued leader in AI.

I think those are two areas. Probably national security area and in the standards area.

Phil Bredezen: In the country, what is the limiting factor there? Is it money to do stuff with? Is it the training of people?

Bill Haslam: Or is it democracy's a little harder than in the controlled economies that we're competing with? You've been in the middle of that.

Michael Kratsios: Yeah. I think what you end up seeing and what's been a little bit challenging with getting legislation done on AI is it's just getting your hands around AI is really tough because it's just so sweeping and so large. You could be talking about individual use cases that certain legislators or certain states have a lot of concerns about. There are other issues that's all about China and how you compete with them. There are other issues about this existential safety issue, about whether or not these models could be used to create biological weapons. There's just so many items on the list that choosing and finding some consensus is the hard part.

But there has been some bipartisan legislation. In Senate Commerce, there's been a proposed piece of legislation around doing some of the standards work at NIST. I think over time, I do think they'll be some small bites taken at it, hopefully in this Congress.

Bill Haslam: Let me shift away from government to business. Tell us a little bit about your company. I'm not looking for an advertisement here. But again, I think people are just trying to get their arms around what's it look like to have businesses that help facilitate this? Again, I'm not asking for an advertisement, but just tell us what you do.

Michael Kratsios: Yeah. If you think about a large language model, it is essentially composed of three ingredients. You have chips, which are the actual chips that train these models. Companies like Nvidia come to mind. The second ingredient to artificial intelligence are the algorithms. Those are the models that companies, like OpenAI, and Google, and Meta build – things like ChatGPT and Bard. Then the third ingredient is where Scale focuses, and that is on data.

In order to train these models, you have to ingest high quality data into these large computing clusters in order to train them. Scale is the largest provider, and developer, and builder of data for training large language models in the world.

Bill Haslam: Sorry, let me interrupt. Just for the uninitiated, large language models. Tell us what you mean.

Michael Kratsios: Yeah. A large language model is like ChatGPT.

Bill Haslam: Okay.

Michael Kratsios: Any of these models. ChatGPT was the first. It essentially can answer a question about anything. You ask yourself, "Well, how does it know about 13th century history," or something? Somehow, it has to be fed that data, and at a high enough level of quality that it minimizes the hallucinations that we were talking about a little bit earlier.

These models constantly need higher and higher quality data in order to improve. We build these models for enterprises and for governments around the world.

Phil Bredezen: Make that just a little more specific for me. Without talking obviously about customers or anything. But specifically, what's a need for that and what kind of a database would you build?

Michael Kratsios: One project that's very near and dear to my heart, given my time at the Pentagon, is around building models for national security use cases.

Imagine if you are an intelligence officer, and you are trying to ingest an unimaginable amount of satellite imagery. You're trying to track the movements of a particular adversary in a particular geography. You want to know when they're moving where, and what they're moving. You essentially need data to train a model, that teaches it what all of the different potential things are that could appear in the image. The specific type of aircraft, the type of tank, missile silos, whatever it may be. You train these models to understand and can identify those objects from your large data streams.

So that you can take that model into theater, and you're attempting to do an intelligence package on a particular domain. You could have the models be able to identify the objects of interest back to you. We help develop those datasets.

Phil Bredezen: You might say, "Okay, for this, I'm going to give you a package which is 10,000 images of various sorts of some kind of airplane on the ground, at some sort of resolution, and here's what it actually is."

Michael Kratsios: Exactly, yes. We take that, and then we train the actual model itself, which the end customer uses.

I think what's very misunderstood about AI is a lot of the focus is on the model itself that just spits out the answer. But the quality, and the power, and the value of the model is 100%

dependent on the quality of the data that you feed it. If you teach on low quality data, it's going to give you low quality answers. That applies both to the large language models, like ChatGPT, and also to the computer vision models, like the ones we were talking about that the DOD uses.

Bill Haslam: Think of your average listener or average citizen out there. How do they think about using AI as a competitive advantage for their business? Again, I know that's the world that you're in now. Help us, again, think about if you know enough to get to first base, in terms of what AI is, but can't get much past that. How do you think about it as a competitive advantage? Whether you're in the healthcare business, whatever it is.

Michael Kratsios: Yeah. I think, to me, I always view artificial intelligence, especially these large language models, as tools which can allow an individual to essentially turbocharge themselves. To be able to allow them to do their job better, safer, faster, more effectively.

When you break down at the very early, most basic stage is what does these LLMs, or these large language models, provide? They're essentially a creative agent that is able to create new language, or new things from scratch. The very early places where you can find a competitive advantage is think about areas where you're generating content. Often times, it's a repetitive fashion. That's why you see a lot of use cases in the marketing or advertising domain, where you're creating new ads every week. Those are places where you can spin up new ideas at a very fast velocity.

I think the other area where you can try to find competitive advantage is around the data that you have. The most valuable thing, I believe, for most businesses going forward is the proprietary data that they have. Remember, these large language models are trained on public data, on things you can scrape from the internet. But if you're a company that has specific data around a particular industry or a particular customer-set that only you have, that data is super valuable. You can point that model at your data, and be able to extract information and value from that that no one else can. From a first principle standpoint, I think it all goes back to doing a data analysis for your firm, and seeing what is the data that you have that no one else has.

Phil Bredezen: When you talk about this, there's almost two ways in which AI impacts people. In one case, it may be a tool which is used. I, in my job, may use, as you've described, an AI to be a second brain, to help me generate things, and so on. But there's also, as is with technology, just there are passive uses a lot. That Spotify gives me recommendations, I'm sure, based on some AI model of things I've done in the past. It's invisible, but it improves the service in some way that they're doing.

If you go down the road, 10 years down the road, and I'm not using AI in my business. Supposed I'm a construction worker, or something. How has it impacted my life? What's different about the way that I shop, or work, or drive, or entertain myself because of AI?

Michael Kratsios: Yeah. To me, I think it maps to the latest trend in artificial intelligence, which is this concept of agents. It's this idea of an artificial intelligence being able to do multistep

processes to solve a problem for you. I think if you fast-forward many years, these multistep processes will be automated for you.

Today, you have in your car, a blind spot detector. Or there's a recommendation on your Netflix of what's coming up next. But you can imagine the most basic things, like you're planning for a trip. Then you can very easily be able to go from, "I want to plan a trip with my wife and my kids." To having the itinerary, to having it all booked, all very, very seamlessly and very, very, quickly. The roadwork of research, analysis, decision making can be accelerated very quickly. It, again, puts people in a position to be leveraging their highest value function. What are the questions we should be asking? What are the projects we want to be working on? Then, the AI can help you deliver those.

Bill Haslam: One of the things we've learned from the technological changes that we've seen over the last 50, 60 years is that there are winners and losers. One of the things that's driven some of our cultural divide, our political divide, et cetera, is the fact that some folks feel left behind when the technology changes. Either their job became automated, or the skills that were required to succeed are different than they were 10 years ago, or five years ago.

Realizing this isn't actually in your bailiwick, but what ideas do you have for helping us not have such dramatic winners and losers due to new technology as we have had in the past?

Michael Kratsios: Yeah. One thing that we worked a lot on in the White House, which I think is critical, is this idea of lifelong learning. And the concept of being able to be nimble as a country and as a society, to be able to retrain and reskill.

I think one thing that was new to me that I realized when I was in government was a lot of the funding at the federal level, and a lot of the focus around education, just historically, has gone towards a focus on higher ed. Take, for example, Pell Grants and their ability to only be allocated towards a four-year degree. You know that 60% of Americans have never gone to college. Those are individuals that live very fulfilling lives, and have amazing jobs, and so on. We need to be able to gear the way that we think about training and reskilling to the entire population. The same types of resources that we provide folks to go to places like four-year degrees could and should be used in places like reskilling and retraining, and areas where this technology could actually help these workers become much more efficient at their job, and much more excited at the work that they do.

Phil Bredesen: Certainly, one of the friction points at the moment is just the whole issue of intellectual property. Obviously, there's a series of lawsuits out there from intellectual property owners about how their property was used, and so on.

Do you have a model in your mind about how this might work in the future? You don't want to lose the ability for AI to access this vast amount of data which is out there. But at the same time, there's legitimate reasons to want to protect intellectual property. Whether it be writing, or art, or anything else. Do you have an approach to that?

Michael Kratsios: Yeah. I will concede, I'm not an IP expert. But it has become a very interesting global debate. One of, I think, the most interesting things that has happened over the last couple of years is the position that the Japanese have taken on IP. They essentially allow legally for the ingestion and analysis of all copyrighted material for AI learning, essentially to promote creative innovations in AI. It essentially removes all consent requirements for copyright holders. On one end, you have that. On the other hand, you have a U.S. system, which is much more focused on protecting IP rights.

My general high level view for the U.S. is that we have to be thoughtful about this, most importantly in respect of avoiding a patchwork of regulations relating to IP. We've seen this in a world of privacy, where the Federal Government has not been able to pass comprehensive preemptive privacy legislation. It's essentially allowed for individual states to create their own patchwork of laws, which has made it very hard for a lot of small technology companies to comply. I think this is an area where, through the right amount of lobbying, and help, and pushing, if we can some federal work on this done, I think will provide a lot of clarity both to the folks working on the models, and all the people creating this incredible intellectual property that's been such a big driver of American success.

Phil Bredezen: Setting aside the impact on politics, which a lot of is talked about. We've both been governors, which means obviously there's politics involved. But also, we build roads, and provide Medicaid, and take care of a host of other kinds of services in the state. Big, complex, sprawling organizations.

If one of us were sitting here as governor today and talking with you, where might you suggest we look to begin with to better deliver government services through the impact of AI?

Michael Kratsios: Yeah. I think in any almost implementation, whether it's in government or whether it's in private sector, I always view it as a crawl, walk, run. You start small, and you expand out. The reality is this technology has an incredible opportunity to unlock lots of time, to spur creativity. It allows you to reduce time on rote tasks, on things like report generation, on processing.

One example that I've always wished that the state or federal government would do would apply this to how it processes requests for information or comments on proposed rules or legislation. You could imagine some of the largest, most important EPA rules get hundreds of thousands of comments, and then literally years are spent processing those because you're required by law to look at every single one. These areas, you could be able to come to the conclusion or do the review of all of these comments in a much, much quicker time, and get the rule out for your citizens.

I think the other area which has always excited me about it is providing— What I've realized when I was in government was a lot of the stuff that we do, most people in the United States have no idea that their government even does this. I think the same is probably right at the state

level. One of the biggest examples I always think about is the Small Business Administration. There's a cabinet level agency that provides lots of tools, resources, financing, and opportunities for anyone in America who wants to start a small business.

Now, if I left my job at Scale, and went back to Columbia, South Carolina, and decided to start a new business, how would I be able to know what's available to me as an American from the SBA? I think that's a perfect example of where a large language model and AI can surface that information for me. I could say who I am, I can say how old I am, what my financial profile is like, what kind of businesses I want to start, and the model could come back to me and give me the opportunities that the government has for me to be able to start my business.

I think that maybe fundamentally it's how can you use AI to better connect citizens with the valuable services that state and federal government can provide to them?

Bill Haslam: Let's just say we're small business owners, and we're saying very much of supercharging what the individual can do is really helpful. I get it, I'm sold on that. But I don't know where to begin. How do I start to use this to my advantage? Whether as an individual or as a business owner.

Michael Kratsios: Yeah. I think the easiest to me is right now, there's four or five really amazing, free, public large language models that you can use. If I was a small business owner, I would ask that my employees or folks on my team take it for a spin for a couple weeks, try to figure out where it could be valuable in the workflow. There are places where having it up on their screen, next to what they're doing, could make them more productive or make their job easier. Then come back to me with how they experienced it.

I think to me, that's a really good start. That will go a pretty, pretty long way. These very sophisticated, multi-year, large enterprise deployments, those aren't really that important. The key thing is just get to running on what's already out there, and see what works, and where you're using it.

Bill Haslam: Let me maybe ask a final question here. The podcast takes its name from Senator Howard Baker's famous quote about listening and keeping an open mind, because sometimes the other person might be right. In that spirit, can you tell us about a time when you realized that the other person or side was right? About this particular issue, in terms of AI and your view of it.

Michael Kratsios: Yeah. I think what's really been, I think, special about working in the AI policy world over the last few years has been how truly bipartisan it was, and how it's been. I think this handover from one administration to the next, over three successive administrations, has been pretty powerful to watch.

The Obama team, in 2016, did a great job with bringing AI to the forefront. They ran a lot of events around the country to talk about its importance. They wrote a report about its potential impacts. That work was handed off to us, when we went into office. We spent four years signing

multiple executive orders, getting bipartisan legislation passed. That was passed off to the Biden team. We launched, and actually the national AI initiative office at the White House in January 2021, before Biden was inaugurated. The director of that office, a now retired professor at the University of Tennessee, Dr. Lynne Parker, was kept onboard and led that office during the Biden administration as well.

To me, I think generally, the idea that every issue is partisan, and you have to pick a side is something that we've been lucky enough, in the world of AI, not for that to be the case. And even maybe some gut instinct that maybe the other guys are doing it wrong. Ultimately if you thought about it, and first principled the questions, you realize that we're all rowing in the same direction to drive American leadership in AI.

Bill Haslam: Well, that's incredibly encouraging. Thanks for that.

Michael, it's been incredibly helpful. Thank you. You've been insightful. You put it in really straightforward language that helps us understand it. We're grateful for your time, and for the wisdom and insight that you shared with us.

Michael Kratsios: Thank you, guys. I was delighted to be here.

Phil Bredezen: Well, it'll be interesting to watch what you do in the future. I suspect we're going to be back to this subject again.

Bill Haslam: Michael, thanks again.

Phil Bredezen: Thank you.

Bill Haslam: Terrific job.

Michael Kratsios: Thanks, guys.

Phil Bredezen: I think we're probably going to be doing these for a long time. The hope of technology, it's interesting. It's evolving rapidly and it's, in a lot of ways, less accessible to people than other things that I've seen happen. Computers, you can somehow understand what they do a little bit. They word process, and do spreadsheets, and operate terminals, and so on. I think most people, something like ChatGPT, it's just a black box.

Bill Haslam: Yeah, agree. Two thoughts, particularly as it pertains to our podcast.

Number one. I'm incredibly encouraged that he said, really for three successive administrations that didn't agree on a whole lot, from Obama, to Trump, to Biden, there's been a remarkable handoff on the research and necessity of artificial intelligence and what's the government's role is in that. That was incredibly encouraging, from somebody that was the middle part of those transitions.

I think the other thing is its just a reminder that some of the bigger issues we face really don't have to break down in these partisan lines that we've had in the past. Making certain that we realize all the possibilities of AI, and while we're limiting the dangers of it, and preparing people for what the future looks like. I don't care what color jersey you're wearing, you ought to have the same view of that.

Phil Bredesen: Yeah. I think there are other issues that are highly polarized now that started out not that way, along those lines.

Bill Haslam: Right.

Phil Bredesen: I think one of the important things to do is just to make sure that nobody in this process sees an opportunity to weaponize it in some way.

Bill Haslam: I think you're right. But it's also incumbent upon leaders to say, "One of our jobs is to help look five years down the road, 10 years down road, and realize as the world changes, we can't just say, "Oops, sorry. Your world just got left behind, tough luck for you." We have to prepare those training alternatives that can help people move as the world moves.

Phil Bredesen: Well, I think every major innovation that has come along has threatened a lot of people. Industrialization did. Obviously, computers have done it.

Bill Haslam: Right.

Phil Bredesen: This is a current incarnation of that. But I wanted to ask him and didn't, about are there aspects of this that you think are particularly susceptible to somehow stretching out along a liberal, conservative, or red versus blue issue. And to really work to avoid letting that happen.

I agree what with you said and what he said, which I think we're at a great space right now. But in part, that's because it's technical, and not real understood.

Bill Haslam: Yeah.

Phil Bredesen: Politicians haven't quite gotten a hold of it yet.

Bill Haslam: No. Fair point. But I still think this is one of those that, as of yet, we haven't drawn a line and said, "Here's where the red team stands, and here's where the blue team stands."

Phil Bredesen: Agreed, agreed.

Bill Haslam: If we can recognize that it's not this is a threat, this is just part of the changing reality. How do we respond do that in the right way? It could be another place to find some

common ground.

Phil Bredesen: It was an interesting conversation. I do think we're going to be back to this one in the future.

Bill Haslam: I think you're right.

Marianne Wanamaker: Thanks for listening to "You Might Be Right." Be sure to follow on Apple Podcasts, Spotify, or wherever you listen to your favorite shows. And please help spread the word by sharing, rating and reviewing the show.

Thank you, Governors Bredesen and Haslam, for hosting these conversations. "You Might Be Right" is brought to you by the Baker School of Public Policy and Public Affairs at the University of Tennessee with support from the Boyd Fund for Leadership and Civil Discourse. To learn more about the show and our work, go to youmightberight.org and follow the show on social media @YMBRpodcast.

This episode was produced in partnership with Relationary Marketing and Stones River Group.