Kevin Swan

17 June 2020

<center>Will the Effect Future AI Have on Us Be Ethical?</center>

It is highly likely that at some point in the future, Artificial Intelligence will become "smarter" than humans. It will be able to perform complex computations much faster than we are capable of. There is too much value in the progression of it for it to be stopped, unless some devastating event occurs that reduces the human population considerably. AI without a doubt has both benefits and downsides and when looking at these, it is crucial to determine whether or not the effects it will have on upcoming generations of Americans is ethical. Technology may have started out as a helpful assistant for humans but it could become so advanced that it replaces them in many fields. AI progression itself is not morally wrong by the principle of respect for autonomy or the principle of beneficence but issues arise when it starts interfering with how society runs. This is why there should be a line drawn wither when AI smarter than humans begin to replace them or infringes human rights in general.

According to the Bank of England, "48 % of human workers will eventually be replaced by robotics and software automation" and according to ArkInvest, "76 million U.S. jobs will disappear in the next two decades" (Arbess 1). This is a massive change that is sure to shake up our country's economy, possibly calling for some alterations to the system such as a guaranteed base income. If our economic system is not changed, many of those employed, especially blue-collar workers will find themselves struggling to get by as they discover they have been exchanged with AI in the workplace. This is not to say there will not be jobs added by AI's progression in fields such as engineering, mathematics, or software development, but this leaves

the lingering question, "What will people with little education do?" Higher education may become a necessity for a job. Additionally, what if a successful, safe, super-intelligent AI really is developed? If this happens, as Sam Harris explains in his TED Talk, "It seems like we would hit a level of wealth inequality that we have never seen before" (Harris). The wealthy will be more powerful than ever. At that point, society would have little use for even the brightest of mathematicians as AI could solve mathematical problems with ease.

Beyond the economic issues, there are political problems with AI becoming superior to humans. Whichever country builds a super-intelligent AI first will be years ahead of other countries. Controversy could stir with enemies of the country. The fear of another country developing super-intelligent AI first can and will put pressure on other countries to do the same. Even "with support from the US defence department, Arkin [who works on robot ethics software at Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta] is designing a program to ensure that a military robot would operate according to international laws of engagement" (Deng 1). Rules of engagement are rules directed to military forces that lay out the degree in which the use of force is allowed. Even if this program is able to work, military robots are still unethical as they do not adhere to the principle of non-maleficence because the intent of them is still to cause harm. The key for a safe, autonomous future is limiting the power of AI to an extent and the only way for this to work is for each country to agree when enough is enough.

There are instances where AI replacing humans is the moral thing to do. Self-driving cars for example can help blind people travel easier. Robots performing surgery can be more stable and precise than real doctors. They can be used for dangerous and time-consuming tasks. After

all, "Economists have shown time and again that automation helps overall standards of living rise, literacy rates improve, average life span lengthen and crime rates fall" (Maney 1). This all sounds like good news on the surface but one must keep in mind that when there are beings more intelligent than humans on Earth, it is a legitimate scenario that we become subservient to them. Even if humans are somehow able to put aside all their self-interests and live harmoniously in a utopia of sorts with AI, the population is sure to grow to unsustainable amounts with such comfortable living conditions. There will be many people who will not be contributing to society while using Earth's limited resources, and one has to wonder what purpose they will have.

None of this is set in stone, however, and it is simply speculation of what our future may hold. There are rules and logic a programmer could implement into AI, but it will never truly be able to understand human ethics. As stated in Maney's article, "AI cannot think about data it doesn't have. It predicts what you want to see on Facebook based on what you've already liked" (Maney 1). For this reason, computer scientists need to be very cautious when designing AI to complete a task, because the most efficient way may unintentionally harm life on Earth if it gets in the way. All of this considered, the progression of AI is morally a good thing, but the problem is we need to know where to draw the line. If everyone could agree on a boundary for AI to not exceed such as when it infringes upon human rights or becomes smarter than humans, there would be few ethical negatives. For many people, AI and the future is a fascinating subject. It always is interesting to see progression in technology but this must be treated as a potential threat if there are no boundaries. Unfortunately, with the potential money and power to be gained, these restrictions are not encouraged to be set. We cannot predict if we will be ready for this

technology when it comes out, so the most we can do is wait and hope the effect AI has on all of

our future generations will be in our best interests.

Works Cited

Arbess, Daniel J. "This Is The Future Of Artificial Intelligence." *Fortune*. Fortune, 15 June 2016.

Web. 3 Feb. 2017.

Arbess begins the article with a statistic by the Bank of England who estimates

around 48% of human workers will be replaced at some point by robotics. He then

goes into detail about what the future may look like concerning the political aspect

of a society where machines have many jobs. The audience may be those who are

interested in the politics and ethics behind advancing AI. The purpose is to make

people aware that technology will be changing the way countries run, for better or

worse.

Deng, Boer. "Machine Ethics: The Robot's Dilemma." *Nature News*. Nature Publishing Group,

15 July 2015. Web. 15 Feb. 2017.

The article's purpose is to gather the thoughts on machine ethics from people

from different occupations who work with robots and to see if AI can reason well

in ethical situations. As this was a news feature, the audience would be people

who read the news that are interested in whether or not AI can understand ethics.

The author does not have an argument, he seems to deliver unbiased information

and the opinions of others in his article.

Maney, Kevin. "How Artificial Intelligence and Robots Will Radically Transform the Economy

Newsweek. Newsweek, 11 Nov. 2016. Web. 03 Feb. 2017.

Maney observes that in the past when jobs were replaced by automation such as

the addition of self-serving gas pumps, professional jobs were added. He also

addresses what will make a person successful in the AI age and more. The

audience this article should be aimed towards is most likely adults who are

concerned about the future job market as the purpose of the article is to look

towards the effects AI will have on the economy.

Harris, Sam. "Can we build AI without losing control over it?" TED. 19 Oct. 2012. Lecture.

      The purpose of this video is for the speaker, Sam Harris to explain why people

should be more worried about AI than they are. The audience are all viewers of

TED talks so he had to be engaging so people continue to watch his lectures as

well as others'. He argues that AI is likely to advance to a level where it becomes

smarter than humans and leaves the problem open as he did not offer a solution,

just gave light to the issue.