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1. You will spend more time on your career than everything except sleep.
2. You will have a much bigger impact on the world in some career than others.
3. We live in a time where there are many pressing issues, and one where one person can make a lot of difference.
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1. Solve a pressing issue: Something with scale and understaffed
2. Find a more effective solution
4. Find work that suits you.
Impact can be measured

- This might feel obvious, but it’s worth thinking about.
Impact can be measured

- This might feel obvious, but it’s worth thinking about.
- One of the key drivers behind the scientific revolution is that the physical world around us can be studied through experiments.
Impact can be measured

- This might feel obvious, but it’s worth thinking about.
- One of the key drivers behind the scientific revolution is that the physical world around us can be studied through experiments.
- So it’s worth re-iterating this again: Your career impact can be measured.
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- If you stop using plastic bags for the rest of your life, you reduce your carbon footprint by about 100kg.
- If you take one less round trip flight to London, you reduce your carbon footprint by 1400kg.
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- If you stop using plastic bags for the rest of your life, you reduce your carbon footprint by about 100kg.
- If you take one less round trip flight to London, you reduce your carbon footprint by 1400kg.
Policy examples

- Drug Abuse Resistance Education: 10 million dollars annual budget, doesn't work at all.
- Scared Straight: Every dollar spent caused $200 worth of damage
Policy examples: The number one graph [link]
## Being good at your job matters [link]

### Data on the dispersion of staff productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field &amp; outcome</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Share of output from the top...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output in “low” complexity jobs among applicants e.g. mail carrier</td>
<td>Hunter, Schmidt, &amp; Judiesch 1990</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output in &quot;medium&quot; complexity jobs among applications e.g. cook</td>
<td>Hunter, Schmidt, &amp; Judiesch 1990</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papers coauthored by mathematicians with at least 133 publications</td>
<td>Clauset et al. 2009</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papers written by scientist (whole career)</td>
<td>Sinatra et al. 2016</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks in Billboard Hot-100 (1970-2018) by musician, among artists with at least 282 weeks in these charts</td>
<td>Tauberg 2018</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Office Gross by US top-200 movie director</td>
<td>Tauberg 2018</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations to scientists (whole career)</td>
<td>Sinatra et al. 2016</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (worldwide, 2005)</td>
<td>Anand &amp; Segal 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks on NYT Fiction Bestseller list by author with at least 6 weeks on that list</td>
<td>Tauberg 2018</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup founder equity by company, among Y Combinator companies</td>
<td>80,000 Hours 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Being good at your job matters

- Replacing a teacher from the bottom 5% with one from the top 5% results in an additional 1.4 million worth of earnings for the average classroom.
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How to define social impact

- “Your social impact is given by the number of people whose lives you improve and how much you improve them, over the long term.”
- “Social impact is about promoting total expected wellbeing — considered impartially, over the long term — without sacrificing anything that might be of comparable moral importance”
Two ways to have more social impact

Degree of improvement

Social Impact

Helping people to a greater degree

Helping more people

Number of people helped
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- “Promoting” implies a positive action.
- When thinking about ethical behaviors we often think about stuff that we *should not do.*
- “Well-being” here is more complicated to define
  - Physical well-being (i.e., life expectancy)
  - Mental well-being
    - Happiness (Are you living the best possible life for you?)
    - Fulfillment
    - Hope
    - Sense of autonomy/freedom
- How do we trade off different forms of well-being with each other?
Total expected well-being

- Total here implies that we’re adding up well-being accumulated from everyone you impact
Total expected well-being

- Total here implies that we’re adding up well-being accumulated from everyone you impact
- EA likes to pretend that we weigh lives equally, but that’s not entirely a well-defined concept either
Total expected well-being

- Total here implies that we’re adding up well-being accumulated from everyone you impact.
- EA likes to pretend that we weigh lives equally, but that’s not entirely a well-defined concept either.
- Suppose you can save only one of two people drowning in a lake, who are of the same age. One of which, if you save, will go on and save 10 other people throughout their lifetime. The other will go on to save 100 other people throughout their lifetime.
Total expected well-being

- Total here implies that we’re adding up well-being accumulated from everyone you impact.
- EA likes to pretend that we weigh lives equally, but that’s not entirely a well-defined concept either.
- Suppose you can save only one of two people drowning in a lake, who are of the same age. One of which, if you save, will go on and save 10 other people throughout their lifetime. The other will go on to save 100 other people throughout their lifetime.
- Small diversion to talk about scope insensitivity.
Scope insensitivity

“Once upon a time, three groups of subjects were asked how much they would pay to save 2,000 / 20,000 / 200,000 migrating birds from drowning in uncovered oil ponds. The groups respectively answered $80, $78, and $88”
“Once upon a time, three groups of subjects were asked how much they would pay to save 2,000 / 20,000 / 200,000 migrating birds from drowning in uncovered oil ponds. The groups respectively answered $80, $78, and $88”

We do a very bad job at conceptualizing large numbers.
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- $E[X] = \int_{\Omega} xp(x)dx$
- Fancy average

- If I have a large number of college students who have an expected lifetime earnings of $5$ million dollars each. The idea is that, after they die, I could average their actual lifetime earnings, it should come down to about $5$ million each.

- Suppose that I’m a good teacher, then maybe I could increase their expected earnings to $6$ million dollars.
In the case with lifetime earnings, expected impact makes a lot of sense because there is a continuum of possibilities.
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- In the case with lifetime earnings, expected impact makes a lot of sense because there is a continuum of possibilities.
- Now think about this scenario: You have a group of 20 people sitting in a room.
- We are going to flip a coin. If it comes up as heads, everyone dies. If it comes up as tails, no one dies.
- Suppose you worked really hard and changed the rules. Now you have to flip two coins, and everyone dies if and only if the two coins both come up as heads.
- Before, ten people are expected to die. Now, only five people are expected to die.
- Did I save five lives?
Follow up on scope insensitivity from Dickert et al. (2015)

- “If I look at the mass I will never act. If I look at one, I will.” - Mother Teresa
- Emotions like sympathy and compassion are stronger when it is easy to visually attend to or mentally imagine the victims.
- Genevsky et al. (2013) finds that when they are shown a photo of the victim as opposed to a silhouettes the reward centers of their brains are activated.
- In fact, telling participants that people tend to “react more strongly to specific people who have problems than to statistics about people with problems” lower their donations in the case where a specific individual (Small et al., 2007).
The original Boyle et al. (1994)

“In 1989, for example, about 2000/20,000/200,000 migratory waterfowl died in these holding ponds. This was less than 1 percent of the 8.5 million migratory waterfowl in the Central Flyway. The affected migratory waterfowl include: mallard ducks, pintail ducks, white-fronted geese, snow geese, and greater sandhill cranes.”

- The paper doesn’t actually give the questionnaire
The original Boyle et al. (1994)

“In 1989, for example, about 2000/20,000/200,000 migratory waterfowl died in these holding ponds. This was less than 1 percent of the 8.5 million migratory waterfowl in the Central Flyway. The affected migratory waterfowl include: mallard ducks, pintail ducks, white-fronted geese, snow geese, and greater sandhill cranes.”

- The paper doesn’t actually give the questionnaire
- ”This is outrageous”
The original Boyle et al. (1994)

“In 1989, for example, about 2000/20,000/200,000 migratory waterfowl died in these holding ponds. This was less than 1 percent of the 8.5 million migratory waterfowl in the Central Flyway. The affected migratory waterfowl include: mallard ducks, pintail ducks, white-fronted geese, snow geese, and greater sandhill cranes.”

- The paper doesn’t actually give the questionnaire

- I think the idea is that they are covering ponds of oil that birds would drown in.
### Results table

**TABLE II**

Descriptive Statistics for Experimental Treatments\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000 birds</th>
<th>20,000 birds</th>
<th>200,000 birds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$78</td>
<td>$88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0–1550</td>
<td>0–1000</td>
<td>0–1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapiro–Wilk statistic(^b)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Outliers removed from data.

\(^b\)This test statistic indicates that these distributions are not normal.
Follow up on happiness and money

**Figure:** I saw this pic on a CNBC article and I had to include it.
Jebb et al. (2018)

- Gallup world poll using 1.7 million respondents worldwide
- In North America, life evaluation maxed out at $105,000, positive affect maxed out at $65,000, and negative affect on $95,000.
Clingingsmith (2016)
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Basic overview of Effective Altruism

- Why don’t we go around and each say what Effective Altruism means to us?
- Here is perhaps the more canonical introduction:
  - We all want to help people
  - We have the same obligation to help a person whether they are drowning in front of us or dying from Malaria thousands of miles away
  - It is better to help more people than less
  - We have limited resources, so it’s important to do as much as we can with what we have
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- Effective Altruists (EAs) have certain areas they like to focus on
- Global Health and Development: We love Malaria Nets and Vitamin A tablets
- Extinction risk reduction: AI Alignment and Biorisks
- Farm Animal/Wild Animal welfare
- If you disagree about a certain area or approach to solving a problem (e.g., RCTs v. growth), that’s still effective altruism! EA is about an approach to life, not a specific cause area.
- We mostly focusing on helping everything think about having an impactful career.
Where does EA spend its money? [link]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause Area</th>
<th>$ millions per year in 2019</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global health</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm animal welfare</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosecurity</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential risks from AI</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near-term U.S. policy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective altruism / rationality / cause prioritisation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific research</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other global catastrophic risk (inc. climate tail risks)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other long term</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other near-term work (near-term climate change, mental health)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>416</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What do EAs do?

For those who answered ‘5’ for engagement, the breakdown was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-engaged EAs cause currently working in (normalised)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement building</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other near term (Near-term climate change, mental health)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause prioritisation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other GCRs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal welfare</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global poverty</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosecurity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure:** Note that these are people who are extremely engaged with the movement
How do EAs think about measuring their outcome [link]

Measuring Good Better
by MichaelPlant, GiveWell, Jason Schukraft, Matt_Lerner, Innovations for Poverty Action
18 min read 14th Oct 2022 18 comments

At EA Global: San Francisco 2022, the following organisations held a joint session to discuss their different approaches to measuring ‘good’:
Give Well’s moral weights

This is 60% from donor surveys, 30% from a survey of people living in extreme poverty in Kenya and Ghana, and 10% staff opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of doubling consumption for one person for one year</th>
<th>1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of averting one year of life lived with disease/disability (YLD)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of averting one stillbirth (1 month before birth)</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of preventing one 5–and–over death from malaria</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of averting one neonatal death from syphilis</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of preventing one under–5 death from malaria</td>
<td>116.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of preventing one under–5 death from vitamin A deficiency</td>
<td>118.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: GiveWell’s moral values of deaths at different ages (in units of doubling consumption)
While Radical Empathy focuses on helping people near and far, Longtermism says that we need to extend our empathy to people in the future, even if they don’t exist yet.
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While Radical Empathy focuses on helping people near and far, Longtermism says that we need to extend our empathy to people in the future, even if they don’t exist yet.

“To see how intuitive this is, suppose that, while hiking, I drop a glass bottle on the trail and it shatters. And suppose that if I don’t clean it up, later a child will cut herself badly on the shards. In deciding whether to clean it up, does it matter when the child will cut herself? Should I care whether it’s a week, or a decade, or a century from now? No. Harm is harm, whenever it occurs.”
Longtermism is the view that:

- Those who live at future times matter just as much, morally, as those who live today
- Society currently privileges those who live today above those who will live in the future
- We should take action to rectify that, and help ensure the long-run future goes well.
Our future is vast

See title link
One of the most depressing graphs

If we look at scientific attention instead, we see a similar picture of neglect (though, some of the individual risks receive significant attention, such as climate change):
Existential risks are quite concerning

- It’s one am and I’ve been reading about them for the last hour
Existential risks are quite concerning

- It’s one am and I’ve been reading about them for the last hour
- Summary: Not pog
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- Everything that’s bad when you believe in longtermism is bad even if you don’t believe in it.
- You don’t need 500IQ to realize that reducing extinction risk is a good thing.
- Personally, whether or not I should be a Longtermist is one of those questions that, even if I knew the answer to, wouldn’t really change my actions much.
- So I sort of ignore it.
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Random variables are not reality

- Whenever we say that $X$ has some percent chance of happening, we are treating $X$ as a random variable.
- When we’re talking about the outcome of a dice roll, modeling it as a random variable makes a lot of sense.
- RVs are actually very fancy math objects, whose formal definition requires that you take multivariable calc, linear algebra, and then measure theory to understand because it’s honestly a deranged object.
- I don’t think it makes sense to treat extinction risks as random variables and use expected values.
The probabilities are too small to reason about.
I cannot justify sacrificing current living humans for abstract probabilities.
We cannot improve what we cannot measure.
Long-term risk mitigation can only succeed through short-term progress.
Summary: think of the long term, but act and measure in the short term.
Go forth and discuss

- When it comes to the future, what do you worry about the most?
- What is most holding you back? What are your biggest bottlenecks?
- What is the biggest mistake you’ve made in the last 6 months that you feel comfortable sharing? Have you successfully changed the default path of the world such that such a mistake is very unlikely to happen again?
- Suppose you leave this conversation with some concrete action points that are obviously good ideas that will majorly improve your life. What are they? Make them concrete and give deadlines.
- Are you procrastinating on anything?
- What is the best and worst thing in your life right now?
- What important truth do very few people agree with you on?
- What is the best compliment you have ever received?
- Do you trust people more if they’re socially awkward?
- Do you get overly affected by social validation?
- What is the most important social pressure that you feel you had to constantly resist?
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