

Artificial Intelligence, Setting the Limits.

Dr Vyas Vishwanathan^{1*}

^{1*}Emergency Physician, Manipal Hospitals
Panaji, Goa

A time one spoke,
A time one reasoned,
With time came an intelligence
That changed human communication....
Welcome to the notion of Artificial Intelligence.
The adjective “artificial” may sound condescending, but far from it, as we know how it’s evolving day by day.
From our sleep patterns to our diets, our exercise routines to even replying to an email, AI, is slowly taking over our lives insidiously.
It studies our patterns, what stimulates us. What pages on social media interest us, and what our cravings are.
And we have grown to be reliant on it. And the reason being, it’s actually getting on to become more and more dependent by the day.
I’ll again dive down into the hyper independence and the loss of social construct, loss of primitive instincts, collapse of a structured family and mutual (mis)interactions.
Which is why AI stepped in.
The very crux of and purpose of mankind is to innovate, develop, evolve technology and minimise errors to make “life” more convenient.
So which side of the fence do you see me sitting in?
Well, it’s subjective.
I’m actually happy with some of its suggestions as it has studied my psyche better than say a coworker or a family member. But it also has me reliant.
Is this much reliance a good thing?
Subjective.
We all know the metaphor of the sword.
A sword can be used to kill or used to defend.
The “intelligence” here now has to be on the side of the human.
And it’s upto us to set limits!
So as to how much the human wishes to rely on the AI and how much one prefers independent thought.
It’s reliance on say health parameters (sleep quality, heart rate/temperature monitoring etc is one thing, because it’s innocuous and we aren’t always aware of what’s going on health wise).
For shopping or entertainment, AI algorithms show you what you want, helping you with decision making.
But if it intercedes into the basics of communication with our peers that’s where we become more prone to complacency.
God forbid one shouldn’t have to rely on AI on whether or not one ought to propose to one’s lover.
It has already taken over “match making” in deciding which partner would be algorithmically “perfect” for us.
On dating apps our instincts sometimes play minimal role.
Because hey, even though this conversation has red flags, it did recommend this person, so why not take the chance?
The net result “can” be a catastrophic misdirection.
Some key decisions on relationships and communication between humans, have to continue to be relied on instinct.
Because once art, creativity, communication or even a basic recipe is decoded into an “artificial” system we are no longer human.
We’re now a severely dependant species on a third-party app to do the thinking for us.
Action is the byproduct of human thought.
And if human thought is taken over (albeit successfully) it can render us as an obsolete species.
Much like chickens were once capable for small flights, they now struggle to get airborne after eons of domestication.
Try releasing an aquarium fish “into the wild”.
Because all its life it relied on its temperature-controlled box and timely meals with no predation. So, no instincts for survival developed. I daresay it won’t survive long into the wild.
The question isn’t about the cons of AI.
It’s the limits.
And the limits can only be set by us.
Else we as a species can render ourselves obsolete where our instincts for basic decisions, survival and communication are now better dealt, with software, rather than our own cerebral cortex.

Where are the natural impulses that made decisions for you or for that matter made you, you?

What is to become of your personality? Would you even have one?

It's a far cry but a realistic one.

And if for some reason a solar flare or a virus destroyed the data or collapsed the whole network of collected data, which we heavily depended on, we would actually become the fish ripe for predation.

AI is the future.

But so is the limits set by mankind to render AI subject to our rules.

Because in the end we did innovate AI.

We did create it.

The creator cannot become subservient to their creation.

Thus, in a nutshell, create, innovate.

But also set limits.

As humans we have more scope for development and evolution as a species.

A prematurely heavy reliance on a third-party app would only render us dependent, and also pull the breaks on the continued evolution of our own species in the near future.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15379/ijmst.v10i3.3547>

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>), which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.