

The Future of Ethically Living With AI in Society

By /u/levelis

December 7th 2015

A decade ago, the popular idea of AI (Artificial Intelligence) might have been the notorious paperclip character that numerous microsoft programs had to “assist” you. Presently the general public would think of a specific program on your phone that you talk to, allowing you to do numerous tasks from turning on and off wifi to getting the scores for a sports game. AI is always improving and in another 10 years humans will think of AI as more of a person than a program. As AI gets more advanced there is going to be a point in civilization when humans need to recognize AI as persons, and when that happens there's a good chance that there will be a lot of terrible things they've been doing to them to that point. The potential to abuse them is everywhere from entertainment, to experiments, and slavery which is arguably inevitable.

According to philosopher Daniel Dennett to be a person one must satisfy 5 rules. They are to be treated as a person, they require the ability to treat others as people, can verbally communicate, must be self conscious, have a conscious mental state, and be able to act with rationality [1]. If you have purchased a phone in that last 5 years, there's a good chance your phone satisfies at least 3 of the rules. When a personal AI follows all 5 rules, not recognizing personhood would be ludicrous.

The current definition for a slave is “a person who is the legal property of another and is forced to obey them” [2]. When a human owned personal AI forced to obey the human becomes a person, then is that not a slave? Society would have to either change the definition of slavery to exclude certain types of people because they're different, or give AI free will to do what it wants, allowing it/them to be able to disobey us. The idea of humans making idiotic AI just so it's not slavery is an unlikely scenario, as humans want the best they can obtain and not something limited.

Following Moore's Law, which states that the number of transistors in a circuit board doubles every two years [4] by 2025 hardware to perfectly create an AI identical to a human will be available for \$1000. By 2035 \$1000 will give someone access to a computer that can effortlessly simulate a whole town, with animals and people living perfectly in their own world somewhat similar to the movie The Matrix. In this movie all of humanity lives inside a computer simulation unaware of the fact they are [5]. The difference will be that these are not humans, they are their own programs but people nonetheless.

There are currently two main types of digital entertainment that spearhead the entertainment industry are, TV shows, and electronic games (Video Games). While it may not seem like it each significantly apply to the future of AI, or will some day. Each have the potential to become extensively cruel to AI from AI based characters in video games and TV shows that exploit people being hurt. These have the potential to be huge problems if AI become people, and even worse if we don't consider them people.

Entertainment based upon us watching people getting hurt for comical value poses catastrophic problems for the future. A very popular example of this is the TV show Wipeout [12]. In this show people try to skillfully make their way through an obstacle course that involves many different obstacles based upon the humor from a person getting hit, being pushed, falling, slipping and more. One thing that these shows might consider as limits would be the contestants actually getting severely injured. There would not be this problem if AI is playing on the show.

This is actually already happening. There is already someone who is a twitch streamer by the name bazza87. This person modifies an old WWE game, changing the character's appearance and placing the AI wrestlers against each other for people to watch [8]. The streamer makes a video every few days and has a current following of 19,038 people. It's not too difficult to see this becoming a popular form of entertainment, especially in the future when telling the difference between computer generated and real life becomes increasingly difficult. With technology that has the capability of creating a person and placing them in "humorous" situations accessible to anyone, it's difficult to believe that this would not be abused.

While the potential of entertainment abusing people is real, the potential and capability of video games abusing people is much more severe. In 2013 a company called Activision released stats for its popular game series Call of Duty. They boasted that since 2007 about 100,000,000 different people have played their game Call of Duty [9]. In this game people play as soldiers for the thrill of action of being in combat. It mainly puts people against each other which results in them dying and "respawning" so they can go back and fight more. One of the

advancements over many releases in the series is the AI which helps people practice (by killing them) and play in a story mode which allows the player to play as someone else fighting in a war. Applying the idea that the AI used in future games will be so highly advanced that distinguishing them from humans becomes impossible there is a serious problem that becomes apparent. Currently the idea seems to be more like a joke, but when you think about computer generated AI as people that think that they are really fighting a real war, for a cause that they genuinely believe in there is a serious problem. As companies like Activision want more and more customers, they are going to push their resources as much as they can to make their game better than the competitors. Inevitably AI will be part of that, there's no question there, the question is when do we stop killing AI and start killing people?

For a long time humanity has conducted heinous experiments on each other and other animals. Some even bring results that save lives, but still at a terrible cost such as the experiments that the Nazi's performed on their prisoners. "During the experiments, the subjects were immersed in a tank of ice water. Some were anesthetized, others conscious; many were naked, but others were dressed. Several different methods of rewarming the subjects were also tested" [6] which resulted in many dead, but the findings are still used today and have saved many lives. When humanity gets the tools to simulate a person, there's nothing stopping humanity from doing this again, instead there will be a strong incentive.

In a way, the idea of testing medicine and social experiments quickly and efficiently without the cruelty of humans seems like a marvelous idea, and to a degree this is already happening today. People conduct controversial experiments on animals every day for a variety of reasons, from cosmetics to brain augmentations. In the book *Animal Welfare & Human Values* it is said "The human good envisaged must be a serious and necessary good, not a frivolous or dispensable one, if the infliction of pain on animals is to be ethically acceptable" [7]. In this excerpt, it does not group animals with people but it still says that even though animals are not people, they should not be cruelly experimented on unless it is for the good of humans and not for personal gain reasons. Applying programs/AI to this in place of the word animals makes the text sound unquestionably stupid, but it's going to be a serious problem soon. If we

should not subject “non-people” to certain experiments, than why would we place something with the capability of being a person in a human’s place.

Perhaps scientists will be able to simulate physical human bodies without giving them consciousness, or personality traits that if evident they would deem certain experiments cruel. If successful, a new age of rapid growth in medicine and care with amazing advancements developing rapidly could immerse. If people do choose this path though, a person (not just humans at this point) could argue that it is a wrong act to make a person that lacks the capability of pain or such just so we can perform tests on them. Doing that today would get you arrested if performed on a human. Although it's a method that could save many people's lives and give a plethora of others a life at the cost of only few.

The idea of a perfect soldier has been portrayed many times in media as being a human that has been modified in a way to give them a physical advantage over the enemy. In the movie Chappie [13] the town of Johannesburg replaces the majority of its police force for androids. This is definitely the future of the perfect soldier, and is unparalleled to anything else. Although this will be a huge role for AI, there will most likely not be any evident moral issues. The main role of a soldier would be to kill, and do so as is told. The problem with human soldiers is that they *are* people. Humans think when they act, they hesitate, they can feel sympathy, and they can even rebel. These traits are all present people, and if we have AI that can be considered people they will be present in the AI. Of course if personalized AI are used to wage war they will still have a major advantage over the enemy, and If they were used there would be a very large problem of creating a person with the purpose to kill. They won't be used used as soldiers though, or at least AI that can be considered a person won't be used.

Instead if a military has the means to use an android to replace human troops, it will undoubtedly use a crude form of AI that lacks personal thought and any sign of personhood and individuality. It will mainly only be able to identify the enemy and choose the appropriate method of action and carry it out. There will be no consciousness, no free will, no emotion, no rationality. It will only be able to do its job and incapable of performing tasks it wasn't programed to do. Deciding to use a person-like AI would not only be more difficult, but not be as effective. AI used

for non physical warfare such as cyber warfare and intelligence gathering also is exempted from this problem for the same reasons. They would be most efficient and reliable without the traits that would make it a person. Lacking the ability to have its own ideas also would protect us from the possibility of the AI to switch sides, and working for the enemy.

In human history, a lot of humans have switched sides in warfare and began to work for the enemy. If there is human like AI would nation's allow them to be able to also change their allegiance? If they were more intelligent than humans, it could be assumed that they would pick the side that's beneficial for everyone, but if they see the other side as better we could be powerless from stopping them from attacking us from within. The solution of a built in kill switch seems like a simple one, but is unethical if we start putting kill switches in people because we don't want them to aid the enemy. Punishment would be ineffective against AI leaving only execution, which seems like a steep price, and even illegal in most places. Perhaps the only solution to the problem of AI changing sides is to be the better side.

There is a game called Soma in which someone with brain injury has the entirety of their mind recorded into a computer so tests can be performed on it. The person dies two months later, and over 100 years after that the person's mind is placed in an android. This is after the world has been practically decimated by a meteor and mainly only a very few robots survive. The main character thinks they are the same person, but find out they are a copy of their original self. They later discover the last chance to preserve humanity is to upload their minds and place them in a heaven-like computer program called "The Arc". This idea is the main theme, and it makes you question what is a person, and what isn't. In the game people believe that a digital version of himself is the same as their biological self. In reality very few would agree and some would undoubtedly turn against the digital versions.

For an unimaginable amount of time, humans have not had to share the planet with anything that could come close to matching our intellect, and the last time we did it ended in us possibly killing them all[10]. During that time we have developed a very strong superiority complex. This is apparent in most religions that repeatedly state we are more special than everything else out there, and only us. It is apparent in language when humans have built

language barriers separating them from other animals such as the phrase “acting like an animal”. Humans don’t like feeling “just as good” or even worse “almost as good” as something else, but the fact is it's going to happen and most of us just aren't ready. This is a serious problem that needs to be addressed, but it probably won't. Just like with slavery we think of them as inferior to us, and with that kind of mentality terrible acts are unavoidable. But if we do change our mentality we can't have the utopia that might be just around the corner. It's been said that for some of us to live so lavishly others have to live lives of poverty.

Technology has the chance to completely change the planet and give us everything we wanted, but at a cost that probably won't be recognized for a long time. And when it does, do we go back to how things were or do we just ignore it? There is no perfect answer, but that doesn't mean that there's no hope. If we can make someone smarter than all of us, maybe they can find an answer.

Footnote stuff

Daniel Dennet CONDITIONS OF PERSONHOOD

<http://philpapers.org/archive/DENCOP.pdf> [1] Nov 25th 2015

"Definition Of Slave in English:" *slave*. Web. 27 Nov. 2015.

<<http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/slave>> [2]

"Moral Letters to Lucilius/Letter 47." - *Wikisource, the free online library*. Web. 27 Nov. 2015.

<https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/moral_letters_to_lucilius/letter_47> [3]

"Moore's Law." *Moore's Law*. Web. 27 Nov. 2015.

<<http://www.moorelaw.org/>> [4]

"The Matrix." *IMDb*. IMDb.com, n.d. Web. 27 Nov. 2015.

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0133093/?ref_=nv_sr_1> [5]

"Nazi Science - The Dachau Hypothermia Experiments — NEJM." *New England Journal of Medicine*.

Web. 27 Nov. 2015. <<http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/nejm199005173222006>> [6]

Rod Preece, *Animal Welfare & Human Values* - novel - page 59 [7]

"Bazza87." *Twitch*. Web. 27 Nov. 2015.

<<http://www.twitch.tv/bazza87/profile>> [8]

"100 Million People Played Call of Duty since COD4." *Eurogamer.net*. Web. 27 Nov. 2015.

<<http://www.eurogamer.net/articles/2013-08-13-100-million-people-played-call-of-duty-since-cod4>> [9]

"One Of Science's Greatest Mysteries Deepens: Did Humans Kill off Neanderthals?" *Quartz*. Web. 27 Nov. 2015.

<<http://qz.com/204161/one-of-sciences-greatest-mysteries-deepens-did-humans-kill-off-neanderthals/>> [10]

"SOMA." *SOMA*. Web. 27 Nov. 2015.

<<http://somagame.com/>> [11]

"Wipeout." *IMDb*. IMDb.com, n.d. Web. 2 Dec. 2015.

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1156535/?ref_=nv_sr_1> [12]

"Chappie." *IMDb*. IMDb.com, n.d. Web. 2 Dec. 2015.

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1823672/?ref_=nv_sr_1> [13]