

Review of: "Beyond the Fear of Artificial Intelligence and Loss of Job: a Case for Productivity and Efficiency"

Robert Gmeiner¹

¹ Methodist University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The claim that machines will take away our jobs goes back to the start of the Industrial Revolution and it has been proven wrong time and again. For this reason, I am pleased that this paper is not so dystopian. When I read about these issues, one thing that comes to mind is that the types of work people do will get reoriented. Any widespread technological breakthrough will render some skills obsolete, and AI is no different. Like the authors, I do not sense massive unemployment from AI, but I also do not believe there will be less need for human work. There will be upheaval as some kinds of human work are no longer needed, though, and this should not be underestimated, and the paper should make this point clear.

I see this paper's reliance on conjecture as a weakness, but not an insurmountable one. At this point, anything anyone writes about the future of AI is conjecture. Predicting the future with meaningful accuracy is well nigh impossible. What the authors need to do is explain why some conjectures are right, and why they aren't. Currently, there is no originality from the authors on this point, but this is where their contribution can be made.

Lastly, although AI can do some things really well, it has two drawbacks that aren't really mentioned in this paper or very many other places. The first regards the potential of AI to assist medical doctors with diagnoses which this paper mentions. This may be helpful, but if it takes the place of doctors, what will become of the medical profession. Will doctors become useless? By that, I do not mean that doctors will be out of work, but I wonder if their knowledge will be limited and their ability to think curtailed by relying on AI, and that may cause the advance of medical knowledge to slow. The second pertains to the reason why the first drawback is an issue. AI systems are trained on some sort of data. That is how they learn what to do. They are good at finding patterns and drawing conclusions from the material they have already "consumed." However, new good data must be fed into the system for it do become "better," and this relies on human contributions. If an AI system creates something from old data, and then trains itself on its creation, all it is doing is magnifying what it already has and the quality of its output may deteriorate. This is a challenge that I have not seen addressed, so I doubt the future of current AI systems in devising their own goals and truly advancing knowledge. I'm not saying this problem won't be solved in the future, but it doesn't look solved to me now. This is why I think the dystopian predictions of AI taking over the world and taking our jobs are misguided. At the same time, I do sense problems with using AI when it starts to make mistakes and people who rely on it (perhaps doctors?) don't know better.

This paper does make good points about what AI can do really well, and there is every reason to use it for what it can do, but I am deeply skeptical of the potential for AI to do the dystopian things some predict. I'm glad the authors aren't

dystopian about it either, but I would like to see more originality in addition to stating others' conjectures.