

Transcript Interview

Niharika Singhal

NIHARIKA:

My name is Niharika and I'm a lawyer and I specifically practice in the realm of IT law, so think about data protection, artificial intelligence and also a huge proponent of free software.

I think AI has a profound effect on the society. It's like the next big revolution in the world. I think it touches upon each person's life, because it's making certain decisions about them, it's sort of having a significant effect on their day-to-day lives, whether we're looking at chatGPT for solving minor questions, it's connected to the banking sector, to the healthcare sector, every sector that affects human life is somehow connected now with artificial intelligence. We're not only now in the era of just having AI as a piece of software that is probably going to do some amazing stuff, but we're actually also progressing to a place where it can actually get implanted into our heads, we have various wearables, so it's become a very pervasive object in our day-to-day lives.

We have it in the form of wearables, we have it monitoring our heart rate, so I don't really see if there's any sub-sector or any aspect of life where artificial intelligence hasn't reached.

What I've heard is, and I think this is sort of uniform across other sectors as well, that AI is going to eat up all your jobs, but I'm actually not a proponent for that sort of an argument simply because of the fact that it was said the same about when Excel era sort of popped in, that now we have these Excel sheets, so nobody's going to use these accounting registers, etc. But as you see, it's just increased our workload many full times, even with these Excel files.

So I also feel that in terms of law, in the area of law, it's not going to take up the job of a lawyer. Society would still need lawyers in order to arbitrate disputes, in order to represent a client. Sure, AI could be of assistance, it could be an aid for lawyers, for judges to help them, to assist them in finding out or researching more into the arguments that they need to put forth, in researching more about the truth, in coming up with an argument in terms of backing it up with facts and judgments.

So it can be a good assistive tool, but I don't really think that it's going to be so transformative that it's going to end the legal sector altogether.

Gerald:

Let's think on the opposite, for instance in a creative process: Do you think it will change something too? Because creativity is something we regard – as human being – as something very unique. Or do you think, it's just a process which AI is able to do as well as humans do?

NIHARIKA:

From a legal standpoint, I can tell you that the judgments so far point to the direction that in order to have any creative element or in order to have copyright in your work, you need to have a creative element that is produced by a human brain or it needs to have the impression of a human personality into the creative works and so the courts have consistently ruled against AI systems having the copyright over works, which means that human creativity is still a significant part of defining what a creative work is and it's always going to be this way. For sure, the law is also progressively modifying, but I feel that human creativity is something that cannot be substituted by artificial intelligence, because we have not reached this stage of super intelligence and so still there is a lot of power in the creativity of a human mind and that's how I would like to see creativity exist in the world.