Review of: "A Perspective for Economic and Social Unfoldings of AI"

Gale Lucas[1]

1 University of Southern California

I offer this this is a review of "A Perspective for Economic and Social Unfoldings of AI" towards the goals stated by Qeios. Specifically, I believe in the idea that work on such platforms should represent a multidisciplinary perspective. Furthermore, Qeios states that "peer feedback is exclusively meant to provide authors with suggestions to improve their papers, and to inform readers of their validity." I hope for this review to achieve these two aims, especially the former.

First, the paper could benefit from collaboration with engineer(s), especially Professor(s) of engineering or other academics. There are many aspects for which the accuracy could be increased through such a collaboration. Especially, as there seems to be a bias against, and thus misunderstanding of, AI. The work says that, for example, the term "machine learning" gives a false impression, but this represents a limited view of learning. Humans are not the only beings that can learn; even simple creatures can learn through association, and machine learning does at least that, as aknowledged in this piece.

This bias can even be seen right from the beginning, as it says "As the expression "Artificial Intelligence" is associated to the idea that the future of human kind is strongly related to its applications, playing a key role as a substitute for human intelligence..." However, that is not in fact that AI is actually associated with this idea. Some people might have that association, but many do not. AI could be seen as augmenting or working alongside human intelligence; indeed, many have this association instead of it ever "substituting" human intelligence (as if it even could). If this, more optimistic view is correct, then when artificial and human intelligence is paired, humans could be allowed to focus more on tasks where human capacities shine (e.g., problem solving, creativity, critical thinking), freed from more repetitive "drudgery" that AI could take over. Furthermore, AI have the potential to be used as tools to improve human decision-making, as teams of AI and humans are better than either teams of only humans or only AI (Kasparov, 2017).

None of these terms like "machine learning," "intelligence," or "deep learning" were intended to be overblown terms for marketing or to create myths, as the work suggests. They are terms -jargon if you will- that developed organically in computer science. There was no intention to create myths or marketing. Contrary to the representation in this work, they are also not wholly inaccurate terms from other perspectives, as I've laid out above.

I find this judgement of these terms from computer science a bit ironic, as the work itself has a lot of jargon that is not accessible to all audiences ("densities and profiles", "etymological adequacy"). More generally, I feel that the content may be hard for others to consume, as the word choice is a bit unnecessarily inaccessible to more general audiences (e.g.,

beyond those listed above, there is also the term "lucid replacement," which -because of this issue- isn't accurate either... the replacement proposed is not particularly expressed clearly, easy to understand, and/or luminous).

While there is a lot of good content in this work, I believe these framing issues detract from the ability of it to convey the essential wisdom that is found elsewhere in the piece.

Work cited

Kasparov, Garry. (2017). On AI, Chess, and the Future of Creativity (Ep. 22), https://medium.com/conversationswith-tyler/garry-kasparov-tyler-cowen-chess-iq-ai-putin-3bf28baf4dba