

Reading Response April 22

Kritika Chugh

SUID: 882046659

kchugh@syr.edu

Bryson developed an argument in the paper by saying first that robots can have rights if we measure them to the social moral society standards. She developed the argument beautifully and the paper's title goes something like "Robots should be slaves". So she generated two contradictory notions there. But still believes that the author is more inclined to saying that Robots are indeed property, and they are obligated to serve humanity, No matter how much advanced and capable they become it is our view that should be clear that they are hear to serve us and not the other way around. It may be possible one day to create a robot that needs to be a part of our society and may require agency and identification, but it does not mean that we owe them that or it is a desirable thing to do. The author in essence accepts that a sentient robot is possible, but it does not mean we are obliged to cater to a machine's needs to be identified. Furthermore, the author justifies the argument by saying that it is important to protect our social institution and human individuals. I personally think that if humans for once make robots equals so does that mean a robot have freedom (if possible) to even dictate responsibility to humans. Basically, I am arguing here is that does that mean we are inching towards misassignment and misappropriation of the resources? But this strict assertion also means that we are restricting users (of robots) and the creativity of the designers. Users, no matter how much advance the robots become should not treat robots as equals and the designers, no matter how much inclined they are towards experimenting with their creativity, should not create robots as companions. But again, since sentiments and to feel for things is a part of being human beings it is uncertain and I am personally not sure whose perception actually matters? Is it the one who feels for an AI or the which just wants to treat it as a slave-2.0.