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Quote 1: “Open-source culture is the only reason why mankind was able to progress technology at such a light speed.”

Explanation: In this sentence exists the false cause logical fallacy. It directly relates human progress to “open-source culture” without elaborating on what that culture is, or how it has contributed to mankind. Instead, it falsely relates the two and claims open-source culture is the “only” reason why mankind was able to progress quickly.

Quote 2: “Instead, the disparity that could be generated by such impositions will place greater power in the hands of the monopolists, and this is a growing and worrying concern.”

Explanation: For some context, this section speaks of the regulations that the EU wants to put on artificial intelligence to prevent malicious intent. The article claims that these regulations would not create a safe market, and instead inhibit open-source development, making it harder to determine if AI applications are good, ultimately leading to a monopoly of big tech companies. Each of these steps are tied loosely to the next with some logical reasoning but cannot be said definitively, which is a prime example of the slippery slope fallacy. There is no guarantee that the regulations from the EU will lead to monopolistic domination of the big tech companies.

Quote 3: “It will deny them from learning and being inspired by what others have learned and built their own.”

Explanation: In the final section of the article, the author stresses the implications of the potential laws. He claims that these restrictions will “deny them [developers and researchers] from learning and being inspired”. This is a black-and-white fallacy. The author is arguing that either there are no regulations and people can learn and develop successfully, or there will be a halt, or at least a major decline, in progress. He does not provide any evidence that there are only these two options.