Response 4: Human-AI Collaboration and Potential Doom of an AI Uprising

In various works of fiction, the robot revolution is depicted as the next worldwide uprising. The ideal worldview envisions a future in which employees are liberated from mundane tasks so that they may devote their time to more significant activities, while the dystopian outlook predicts that millions of people will lose their jobs and the economy will be in shambles.

These articles [1,2] provide an intriguing perspective on how artificial intelligence (AI) may usher in the next calamity the next major crisis in human history. The articles highlight AI's impact on the economy and the workplace. They demonstrate how the economy and the job market have been hit by and benefited from technological advancements, and how AI has been unfairly criticized for things on which it has had only a little impact. However, other variables, such as the much-debated globalisation, deregulation, non ai technical innovation, have so far had a greater influence on employment and workspace. The publications' claims that AI has had a limited impact on the economy so far are accurate. These assessments, sadly, only compare AI in its infancy. I believe, things can take a drastic turn as AI advances, as it is advancing now at an exponential rate. In the end, the article [5] contradicts itself and states that the existing state of affairs may change in the future as the new technology spreads across the economy and increases in adaptability and strength. Many hypotheses have been proposed by economists to explain this delay; for instance, the J-curve illustrates the time required for an initial investment to bear fruit. As a result, the arguments previously presented for why AI has not had a detrimental effect, and thus is unlikely to in the foreseeable future, no longer hold water. With just one statement, the writers appear to dispel all possibility of resonance.

According to Erik Brynjolfsson [3], AI and automation have largely aimed to replace human work rather than cultivate human potential or open up new avenues of expression because of their emphasis on mimicking human intelligence. According to his article, the overemphasis on humanoid AI reduces salaries for most people while giving those who own and control the technology more market power. He states that the reason for the growth of billionaires during a

period when average real earnings for many Americans have plummeted is the focus on automation rather than augmentation. Long-term, he believes, more value is generated by applying AI to the creation of brand-new goods and services than by attempting to merely replace human labour. He argues that firms are more likely to simply replace a human with a machine rather than rethink procedures and invest in technologies that make use of artificial intelligence (AI) to increase product offerings and employee output. My question is: How close do we think AI will get to effectively mimicking human behaviour? Can we give a machine knowledge that usually entails millions of years of biological evolution to grasp? Furthermore, even if AI is capable of automating the labor humans do right now, will it necessarily remove our jobs or merely offer an extra pair of helping hands? The research is summed up by the author's suggestions for how to reduce or eliminate incentives that favour automation over augmentation. However, the results of augmentation and automation might be the same. Policymaking and the incorporation of ethics and fairness into the design of such machines have the potential to transform automation into collaborative partners in the workplace.

Humans and robots may be seen as complementary if, as Erik Brynjolfsson [3] believes, AI is designed to aid humans rather than replace them. Instead of worrying that machines would take human jobs, the article shows AI designed to aid us is already altering and worsening work conditions [4, 5]. Companies now have access to potentially harmful technologies for monitoring, management, and incentive of employees. Continual real-time micromanagement, automated assessment based on a rigid set of objectives, and pervasive monitoring by automated AI-powered monitoring systems have all taken a major toll on the physical and mental health of workers. [6] As we discussed in our previous lectures, I believe that while technology is not inherently dangerous, it may enable employers to exert tight control over people and oppress and mistreat them for maximum profit. Other than the examples mentioned in the article [4], according to one study, Amazon warehouses that utilize robots had a higher rate of worker injuries than those that don't [7]. Another study claimed that some workers have

resorted to urinating in bottles rather than taking a break due to the stress brought on by time-based automated evaluations at work [8]. This links in with the important issue that augmentation, like automation, does not guarantee a future of Human-AI collaboration. Implementing effective and sustainable policies contributes to a more equitable allocation of resources. AI isn't intrinsically corrupt; the problem is in the uses to which we put it.

References:

[1] Peter Stone, Rodney Brooks, Erik Brynjolfsson, Ryan Calo, Oren Etzioni, Greg Hager, Julia Hirschberg, Shivaram Kalyanakrishnan, Ece Kamar, Sarit Kraus, Kevin Leyton-Brown, David Parkes, William Press, AnnaLee Saxenian, Julie Shah, Milind Tambe, and Astro Teller. "Artificial Intelligence and Life in 2030." One Hundred Year Study on Artificial Intelligence: Report of the 2015-2016 Study Panel, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, September 2016. Doc: http://ai100.stanford.edu/2016-report. Accessed: September 6, 2016.

[2] Michael L. Littman, Ifeoma Ajunwa, Guy Berger, Craig Boutilier, Morgan Currie, Finale Doshi-Velez, Gillian Hadfield, Michael C. Horowitz, Charles Isbell, Hiroaki Kitano, Karen Levy, Terah Lyons, Melanie Mitchell, Julie Shah, Steven Sloman, Shannon Vallor, and Toby Walsh. "Gathering Strength, Gathering Storms: The One Hundred Year Study on Artificial Intelligence (AI100) 2021 Study Panel Report." Stanford University, Stanford, CA, September 2021. Doc: http://ai100.stanford.edu/2021-report. Accessed: September 16, 2021.

[3] Brynjolfsson, E. (2022, January 12). The turing trap: The promise & peril of human-like Artificial Intelligence. American Academy of Arts & Sciences. Retrieved September 12, 2022, from https://digitaleconomy.stanford.edu/news/the-turing-trap-the-promise-peril-of-human-like-artificial-intelligence/

[4] Dzieza, J. (2020, February 27). How hard will The robots make us work? The Verge. Retrieved September 12, 2022, from https://www.theverge.com/2020/2/27/21155254/automation-robots-unemployment-jobs-vs-human-google-amazon

[5] Stewart, E. (2021, July 2). Robots were supposed to take our jobs. instead, they're making them worse. Vox. Retrieved September 12, 2022, from https://www.vox.com/the-goods/22557895/ automation-robots-work-amazon-uber-lyft

[6] Milmo, D. (2021, November 11). Algorithmic tracking is 'damaging mental health' of UK workers. The Guardian. Retrieved September 12, 2022, from https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2021/nov/11/algorithmic-monitoring-mental-health-uk-employees

[7] Mui, C. (2022, June 22). The Amazon robots are here and they don't even have to be kept in cages anymore. Fortune. Retrieved September 12, 2022, from https://fortune.com/2022/06/22/amazon-robots-proteus-labor-shortage/

[8] Liao, S. (2018, April 16). Amazon warehouse workers skip bathroom breaks to keep their jobs, says report. The Verge. Retrieved September 12, 2022, from https://www.theverge.com/2018/4/16/17243026/amazon-warehouse-jobs-worker-conditions-bathroom-breaks