

# The ambiguity of artificial intelligence in scientific production

A ambiguidade da inteligência artificial na produção científica

Lucas Guimarães Bloc<sup>1</sup> |  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8528-131X>

**Special issue** | Frontiers of Artificial Intelligence: Innovations and Challenges

## Editorial

### How to cite

Bloc LG. The ambiguity of artificial intelligence in scientific production. Rev Científica Integrada 2023, 6(spe):e202324. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59464/2359-4632.2023.3147>

### Conflict of interests

There is no conflict of interest.

**Submitted on:** 10/04/2023

**Published on:** 10/04/2023



### Lucas Guimarães Bloc

<sup>1</sup>Psychologist, psychotherapist and professor of the Postgraduate Program in Psychology at the University of Fortaleza (UNIFOR).

**Revista Científica Integrada (ISSN 2359-4632)**

<https://revistas.unaerp.br/rci>

We live in a time of many questions that seem not to keep up with the speed at which artificial intelligence (AI) is developing. The advances are immense and surprising, putting human beings in confrontation with themselves, sometimes not being sure if they really are advances and placing them in a certain place of vulnerability in the face of the risks and threats that, supposedly, AI could represent. It oscillates between fascination and fear, euphoria and caution, hope, and consternation. What is seen as advancement, as a step taken in technology, is confronted with questions about its implications for humanity, especially when the possibility of replacement is evoked. This is a path of no return, in other words, what AI has brought in its different scenarios seems to be here to stay.

Given the diversity and breadth of AI, I chose to focus this editorial on scientific production in health. The development of research requires that the scientist assume the role of protagonist, author and responsible for what he subscribes to. This is a centrality that cannot be lost. AI tools must be used as an instrument, as a means and not as an end in themselves. They are not, and could not, be protagonists, as there is a starting point that still seems to require the presence of the researcher, whether in the construction of the AI itself, or in the constitution of a field of investigation.

It calls for the good use of AI, but what would that be? It is not about thinking of it as something that replaces human beings, but that can enhance their actions. The more it assumes a substitutive dimension, the more there will be a risk of establishing a dependency that could have the consequence of removing the researcher's role as subject, his protagonism, as mentioned, which results in possible lack of responsibility for what is produced. The challenge is also ethical and seems to confront us with a blurred border between man and AI. Without clear and well-established limits, there is a mixture that has changed the way science is done.

To understand this entire process, I am inspired by the French philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty who, in the mid-1940s, was already questioning the ways of doing science, a task that is part of the phenomenological tradition. For the author, talking about science is talking about the lived world on which, inescapably, it is constituted. To think about scientific rigor, it would be necessary to awaken to the experience of the world, as science is, and always will be, a second expression, as the philosopher said in the book *Phenomenology of Perception* (1945).

AI changes the experience of the world, it can enhance certain actions and productions, but it does not replace the human experience on which science focuses. It is not the enemy, but for it to be effective as an ally, it needs to be positioned clearly. It is even necessary to have a method, so that it does not become an ally, not of the development of research, but of the superficiality, mediocrity and lack of rigor that surrounds the scientific world.

With Merleau-Ponty and his ambiguous philosophy, we are invited to leave the dichotomy that would require an evaluative position regarding AI, that is, a condition that attributes a dichotomous meaning between something favorable or unfavorable, good, or bad for science and its production. Let us assume the tension of this indeterminate place that makes it impossible to clearly demarcate such polarities. The borders are not rigid and here they are full of traps. We cannot and, probably, will not be able to remain oblivious to what AI challenges and summons us.

It also reveals the world in which we live and on which science must continue to build. As Merleau-Ponty would say, “The entire universe of science is built on the lived world”. AI is part of this world and invades us in the flesh of the world, in our coexistence. For those who propose to do science, on the one hand, I say, we have no way of escaping, as this would require leaving this world in which we are part and on which AI is established; it would be, naively, to try to alienate oneself. On the other hand, we need to be attentive, involved, so as not to succumb to the ethical limits and risks that AI brings with it. The invitation to ambiguity is for us to leave superficial views aside and always remain attentive, at the same time, to the charms and traps that AI can present, as they are two sides of the same coin.

## References

Merleau-Ponty, M. *Fenomenologia da percepção* (C. Moura, Trad.). São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1994. (Texto original publicado em 1945).

### Author contributions

Bloc LG is responsible for the ideas and preparation of the text.

### Editor

José Claudio Garcia Lira Neto

### Copyright © 2023 Revista Científica Integrada.

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons CC BY License. This license allows others to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon your work, even for commercial purposes, as long as they give you credit for the original creation. It is the most flexible license of all available licenses. It is recommended to maximize the dissemination and use of licensed materials.