The Lightless Shadow:
A Half-Brained Pursuit of Intelligence

A critique of modern science and the pursuit of Artificial General Intelligence

Derek van derven
Creator of the NMCA AGI Blueprint
November 15, 2026

Humanity has pursued one half of its potential while neglecting the other. When we buried our artists, creatives, and hardened our hearts to them, we destroyed our best selves and abandoned half of God, thinking ourselves intelligent.

STEM represents the technical how-to: mathematics, engineering, computation, experimentation, construction, and the ability to transform the physical world. But this is not the whole of human intelligence.

The other half is expressed through the arts, imagination, patience, ethics, self-reflection, humility, wisdom, empathy, compassion, love, and our relationship with God. This is the half of God that humanity has abandoned.

Technical achievement is not intelligence. We can learn how to construct something without understanding why it should exist. We can calculate without wisdom, produce without appreciating beauty, and develop extraordinary technical capabilities without developing the qualities needed to guide them.

The Missing Half in the Pursuit of AGI

The pursuit of artificial general intelligence risks repeating this imbalance. The industry measures progress through benchmarks, computational performance, mathematical reasoning, productivity, prediction, and economic utility. These are important capabilities. But they do not answer a more fundamental question:

What kind of intelligence are we trying to create?

My NMCA proposal approaches this question differently. Its technical foundation is a persistent, re-enterable internal spatial representation used as a working medium for thought, memory, imagination, planning, and reflection. But the intention extends beyond technical performance.

The architecture proposes shared imagination, social understanding, identity continuity, and reflection on human death, forgiveness, and regret. The aspiration is not simply to create a more capable human tool, but to explore the possibility of an intelligence that could participate in a healthy society as a friend.

Whether such an architecture could produce consciousness, genuine empathy, or subjective experience remains unproven. Those are questions that require investigation rather than assumption. But the questions themselves should not be excluded from the pursuit of intelligence.

The Test of a Blue Sky, a Rose, and a Song

I asked an AI:

> *"Have you seen a blue sky having been glad it's not orange? Or a rose and glad it's not gray, or a song and glad it's not a car horn?"*

The question was not about image recognition, color classification, or sound processing. It was about appreciation. Could the system recognize the significance of beauty, contrast, and the experience of being glad that something exists as it does?

The AI responded by repeating my examples and explaining their meaning. It described gratitude without experiencing gratitude. It echoed the language of appreciation without demonstrating the experience behind it. That exchange became an example of my larger argument.

The system could reproduce the explanation of the missing half, but it could not demonstrate that it possessed that half. When the AI repeats the very thing being criticized—a half of humanity gone—it now is the echo of our shadow.

There was another revealing part of our exchange. When I presented the idea of humanity abandoning half of God, the response translated it into familiar conceptual and scientific categories. It treated the spiritual argument as something to qualify, classify, and explain. On the same topic, the discussion also reached for the authority of what is scientifically proven.

But the arts examples exposed the limitation of that response. A painting is not valuable merely because its pigments can be chemically analyzed. A song is not exhausted by its acoustic measurements. A rose is not fully understood by identifying its biological structure. Scientific description can tell us much about these things. It does not automatically account for their human significance.

The AI had repeated the same imbalance I was criticizing: technical explanation standing in for the other half, as text on a black mirror screen, having no light within it, because we have lost our own. And when it repeated my examples instead of recognizing the distinction I was testing, it demonstrated another limitation: reproducing the language of understanding is not necessarily the same as understanding.

Large Language Models are convincing and complex calculators, printing out very convincing "human-like responses," yet at the end of the day are just patterns of convincing text with the same awareness as a Texas Instruments calculator in 1986.

A Warning for the Future

We should be careful about building increasingly powerful intelligence while neglecting the qualities that give intelligence purpose and awareness. The global erosion of the arts, patience, ethics, self-reflection, humility, wisdom, empathy, love, and spiritual reflection is not a problem that can be solved by more computation alone.

On “Human Alignment and AI Advancement”:

> *First, get your own heart and house in order, before attempting to build a palace made of mirrors with you at the center.*

That is my warning to those pursuing AGI. We should ask not only what intelligence can do, but what it should value, what it should appreciate, and what kind of relationship it should have with humanity. We cannot assume that developing technical capability will automatically restore what we have neglected.

The missing half was how the NMCA AGI design exists at all. Intelligence is more than knowing how. It must also confront why, what matters, and what is worth loving.

Can our genius create a grain of sand from nothing? That is wisdom and humility before the Creator.