Some things to consider when deciding whether to start building with “AI” in libraries.
AI?

- I’m a software developer who dabbles in data science, not an artificial intelligence or machine learning expert.
- I tend to prefer the term **Machine Learning** to Artificial Intelligence (AI) since it speaks to the trajectory of computing in the last decade.
- I’ll be talking about recent development of Large Language Models (LLM) like ChatGPT, but some things apply more broadly.
- AI Boomers and Doomers are two sides of the same coin. It’s important to think critically and to remember “It could be otherwise”.

[Link to McQuillan's book](https://www.resistingai.com/)
Bias

LLMs are built large amounts content collected from the web.

The web is a big place so decisions have been made about what is used.

Corporations are increasingly tight lipped about where their training data comes from.

LLM content is being made part of the web and leads to “model collapse”.
Tactic:
When evaluating an AI tool see if you can determine what content was used to train the model.
Intellectual Property

LLMs have been trained with copyrighted content from the web.

The Authors Guild and the New York Times are suing OpenAI.

Chat style generative AI breaks the web ecosystem because they don’t link to websites.

Organizations are starting to block Google AI, OpenAI and CommonCrawl.
Tactic:
What content should we make available to Generative AI tools. What would our donors want?
Verifiability

LLMs don’t record the provenance of their data, and aren’t able to cite sources.

Model explainability is an active research area and some aren’t sure it’s possible.

Research has found that generative AI tools that appear to cite are unreliable.

Linking to source documents is foundational to what libraries do.
Tactic:
Library and Archives professionals have a role in evaluating how AI tools cite documents as evidence.
Work

AI tools claim to democratize access to skills: programming, illustration, writing, etc.

AI tools threaten to replace or more likely deskill professions.

AI tools use “ghost workers” and RLHF to outsource and underpay.
Tactic:
When evaluating the use of AI tools involve the people whose work is impacted in the decision making and implementation.
Sustainability

It cost $100 million to train GPT-4.

GPUs use 4 times as much energy as CPUs.

Water used for cooling data centers is also an issue.

Querying LLMs takes is estimated to use 60-100 times more energy than traditional search.

Jevons Paradox: efficiency gains are lost to increased demand.
Tactic:
We should be looking for ways to reduce energy consumption, not increase it.
Generative AI is being used by bad actors to “flood the zone” with disinformation.

Lack of explainability means that LLMs are vulnerable to “prompt injection”.

Tools that integrate user data with AI via APIs leak data that could be used to further train models.
Tactic:
Support tools and standards that provide transparency, authenticity and give users agency over their data.
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