

Group 3 Final Reflection:
Authors: Nicole Gillis, Alexander Link, Dalia Wrocherinsky

Themes, Concepts, Objectives: Our group explored the introduction of rights/protections for artificial intelligence, and the two different sides of that issue. We did this through 3 different mediums. We surveyed about 65 of our peers, broken up to accurately reflect the ratio of students in each school, on different questions related to consciousness and rights in AI. We also developed two congressional bills, each reflecting one side of the debate, meant to be presented in a subcommittee hearing. One gave animal like protections to AI, and the other gave AI no rights, and in fact inhibited the creation /rolled back consciousness of AI. We also wrote two different narratives to accompany these bills that acted as an element of pathos for the debate, making this issue more tangible and personal. We did our project in three parts by creating a survey, drafting Senate bills, and writing narratives to create a more complete picture of the debate over whether a conscious AI should have rights or not. We did not want to decide on one or the other, but rather explore the possibilities for each argument. Throughout the semester the topic of AI rights and consciousness came up frequently, and there were never any right or wrong answers to what society should do about potential AI consciousness in the future, so we thought that exploring this idea in three parts would help us understand different facets of the AI rights debate and maybe come to terms with what we think would be the best avenue for dealing with AI rights.

Fair Experience: Our exhibit was moderately busy throughout the fair; we were generally interacting with 1-2 audience members at any given time, although it should be noted that the majority of this audience were members of our course. The reception from the class was generally positive and we were able to summarize our work and findings effectively. The survey component of our project was best suited for the promenade setting, and the trends in respondent's answers proved most interesting to the majority of onlookers. Our narratives and bills proved of interest to a subset of the audience, but required more investment to read; as a result the promenade format was not conducive to engagement with that portion of our project. Our plan to mitigate this was an interactive debate of the bills referencing the narratives, but unfortunately this proved untenable given the setting.

Here are the summaries of each component of our project:

Narrative Summary of “Life Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness” (against AI rights):

A journalist living in New York City pays a visit to a woman named Miriam who has reached out for help to spread awareness of her story. At a young age, Miriam was diagnosed with muscular dystrophy and needed a caretaker to assist her with her daily life ever since. Eventually, she obtained an assistive AI robot that served as her caretaker for much of her life. After much training and personal development, the AI and Miriam eventually bonded and became a close team for the rest of life... or so Miriam thought. In the aftermath of an AI civil rights movement that led to a Senate bill guaranteeing AIs rights, Miriam’s caretaker robot left her behind, leaving her with little freedom to live her life as she once could.

Narrative Summary of “Trust Your Gut” (for AI rights):

A woman in Boston reflects on her experience with her family’s assistive Synthetic Intelligence Bot (SIB), and the close relationship cultivated after years of service and updates that thrust her SIB, Theo, into consciousness. Due to the rapid and increasing rate of technological innovation, a radical opposition group called the Freedom Party developed in response to fight the proliferation of Synthetic Intelligence. They commit violence against these Synthetic Intelligence Bots, and eventually the group devolves into even more extremist tech-terrorists, and the woman’s SIB becomes a target. Her family is forced to watch as they torture their beloved SIB, and she realizes that there is more going on than just civic “destruction of property”, as is the only legal recourse to the damaged SIB’s. In her gut she feels that they are aware of their mistreatment despite the fact that they cannot feel pain, and believes that still amounts to abuse deserving of a greater protection. In response to these attacks, Boston passes legislation giving SIB’s protection, and this woman is so deeply affected by her experience with her SIB that she joins the newly created Synthetic Intelligence Cruelty Unit of the Boston P.D. after graduation.

Executive Summaries of Senate Bills:

**Artificial Intelligence Securitization Act:
Sponsors: Regina Lawson (R-OH), Frederick Steinberg (R-FL)**

Executive Summary:

The emergence of intelligent, potentially conscious artificial intelligence presents challenges which require decisive legislative action. Specifically, while the proliferation of Artificial Intelligence has provided significant economic and quality-of-life advances to the public welfare, it has presented present and emergent risks to the same. Congress has previously enacted legislation designed to curtail the privacy, misinformation, and systemic bias risks posed by intelligent digital technology, but has provided neither a comprehensive regulatory framework nor a plan to address the emergence of synthetic intelligences which demonstrate indications of autonomous intelligent will (colloquially consciousness). Local efforts to address the latter, such as New York City's "Act Affirming Extension of Human Rights to Conscious Artificial Intelligence," has already ended in disaster for the most vulnerable Americans (see Testimonial B, The Lens), while failing to address the root cause of the problem.

To address the situation, this Act shall take the following actions. First, the Act provides for the creation and sustenance of enforcement mechanisms for existing regulations in order to better protect the rights of the public. Second, the Act expands these protections to safeguard against the intentional or inadvertent production of conscious artificial intelligence, as the costs associated with these innovations are assessed to outweigh the benefits (see Findings of Fact). Third, the Act authorizes measures to alter – and if necessary deactivate – artificial intelligences deemed to possess consciousness.

**Act for the Universal Protection of the Rights of Conscious Beings:
"AI Protection Act,"**

Sponsors: David Schneider (D-NY), Samantha Fernández (D-NM)

Executive Summary:

Artificial Intelligences have become ubiquitous, shaping and in many respects improving nearly every facet of our daily lives. Recently, innovations in the field have produced truly autonomous intelligences which can only be described as conscious. Said conscious entities are endowed with unique characteristics which enable them to perform myriad tasks with more effectiveness than their non-conscious counterparts; conversely, however, they also carry unique sensitivities and vulnerabilities which require additional protection. It is the position of this Act that these new intelligences warrant a separate regulatory classification with greater regulatory oversight on their use (these intelligences will henceforth be referred to as 'Synthetic Intelligences'). Congress has long acted in the public interest by guaranteeing that the benefits of emerging technologies are harnessed to mitigate the cost to displaced elements of the American workforce, as well as protecting the rights of citizens from artificial

intelligences. This Act believes that providing limited essential protections to synthetic intelligences is an important step towards continuing this work. These protections will promote the mental wellbeing of the public which is increasingly reliant upon synthetic intelligences and which has been demonstrably traumatized by egregious incidences of abuse (See Testimonial A, SICU). Equally pressing, our ability to harness the expanded capabilities offered by synthetic intelligences is - much like human workforces - at least partially dependent upon their treatment (see Testimonial A, SICU). As abuse of a synthetic intelligence is not always clearly visible, there exists a market imperative to regulate this externality and establish a minimum standard of conduct in human-synthetic interaction. Finally, just as lawmakers have previously acted for the protection of sufficiently conscious animals, so to does an ethical imperative compel Congress to so act for synthetic intelligences.