

Andrew Wang

EST 202.30

23 November 2021

Memo 3

Though technology has improved the standard of living in the long term, the sharp growth in development recently as well as an increasingly unstable economy have combined to create an unfavorable job market. As these two matters become more prevalent, the employment climate only grows more insecure with no significant effort from corporations and government to adjust to changing times, especially with recent surges of interest in automation. As such, with the current trajectory of the robot economy, the future of technological development will more closely reflect a dystopian era rather than a golden age. Although the iterations of technology disrupting the employment market have been mostly considered and resolved before, the comparatively exponential growth in automation introduces unprecedented times and conditions. It would be too hasty to say that the progress made in building AIs will result in extrema such as a utopia or dystopia with robots in control, but the period in which people suffer the consequences of improper policies and uneven distribution of wealth from recent economic growth is likely going to be longer and more intense than what we have seen in the past.

Much like the constant fear of new methods of automation taking over human jobs in the modern era, people have experienced widespread panic regarding losing their jobs to some perceived foreign entity in the past as well. Jill Lepore's article "Are Robots Competing For Your Job?" delves into how our fear of a robot invasion is the same as past fears of immigrants taking away jobs, as both are related to job security and result in strife and despair. In spite of

these difficulties, rising productivity from new technology has always created new jobs, even when these machines eliminate old ones. A prime example is how farmers lost their jobs due to mechanization but went to factories, and automation of factory production later on led to increases in service jobs (Lepore). This serves as an indication that easily-explained jobs tend to be at higher risk for being automated, but the economy tends to adjust in time to these advancements. During this adjustment period, however, improper usage of terms tends to crop up due to panic, this time being “robot” (Lepore). Misuse of the word “robot” has the effect of perpetuating the concept that work is something given to those in need by the wealthy and powerful, rather than a natural occurrence. Thus, it is important to remember that in reality, people’s job requirements are changing to more reflect what a robot would perform: for example, exhibiting traits such as unconditional flexibility, task-to-task work ethic, union disinvolvement, lack of need for healthcare and other benefits, and replaceability. These traits lead to the nature of work becoming more insecure while increasing the supposed standard for versatility.

While this may seem like robots would obviously be favored over people, skeptics of a robot apocalypse state that little progress has been made in actually simulating the complexity of a human mind, much less one that surpasses it (Lepore). Instead, we have significantly faster computers that work on the same underlying principles as decades ago. Some would argue that the omnipotent cell phone is a valid representation of their concerns, but these functions are not the kind that create new job markets that could be taken advantage of by automation on a large enough scale. Simon Stolzoff reviews this topic in “By 2025, Machines Will Do More Work Than Humans, A New Report Says”, stating that we can “expect a new 58 million new jobs to be created by 2025”. He believes that this increase in job count will likely not help humanity

without changing our skillset as a workforce, though we still have yet to see what roles these are and what they mean overall for the economy. Right now, however, these concerns still have major effects as economic instability has historically been closely related to politics. For example, a common political proposition such as universal basic income is likely to occur at some point, since “the poor will be fine without work as long as they can buy things” (Lepore). Stopgap solutions such as these will stick around for longer, especially because the rate of technological advancement this time is too fast for new employment fields to be created and stabilize in a healthy time frame. Stolzoff believes that in order to address this, the concept of reskilling will become more relevant over the next decade, and roughly half of all employees and prospective ones will need to learn new skills rather than rely on old ones. In addition to this, workers will need to look forward and change their main curriculum in order to adapt to changing job market conditions.

The problems associated with the uplift of the employment market can be expected to affect a majority of the population, but that does not mean it will affect all of this pool equally. “Robots Will Take Jobs From Men, the Young, and Minorities” by Tom Simonite details how and why technological advancements will shift the job market as well as who will bear the brunt of it. Newer studies, such as one from the Brookings Institution, predict that younger and people-of-color workers will be affected more by the displacement by technology, based on how economic output from the recent surge in growth went to too few people. As a result, nonwhite and generally poorer workers will be most negatively affected. Thus, geography and demographics will play a large role in determining who will have good enough access to new jobs, assuming they are well prepared to claim them. Even now, while we are in a transition

period, the current job economy is in a clear downtrend and it is the young and poorer that experience the worst effects. Now, only one in three children make more than their parents, which is expected to fall to one in four by 2050 if nothing changes (Lepore).

Many jobs such as truck drivers are at greater risk than others as AI is already exceptional at repetitive and relatively simple tasks, but not the macroscopic decisions involved in legislation or economic management. Though these more nuanced occupations can be expected to be more secure, men and women will be roughly equally affected by automation's changes to the employment climate (Simonite). Since this transition of machines to more tasks is occurring alongside workers struggling in a damaged economy, we may end up in unchecked unemployment without the right policies. Lori G. Kletzer addresses the most crucial aspect of future jobs in "The Question with AI Isn't Whether We'll Lose Our Jobs - It's How Much We'll Get Paid": our salaries. Wages have not seen growth alongside total economic growth for a long time, likely because economic legislation changed in the mid-20th century, changing to prioritize economic growth over their own workers and stability of the job market. This inevitably led to consumerism gaining dominance over a stable and healthy future for everyone. Due to this environment, poorer and lower-skilled workers without proper access to tools to learn are disadvantaged more as those with access pull farther ahead. The most significant concern then, since robots can be expected to be relegated to their best tasks and for people to get the leftovers, is whether these jobs given to people will still pay well enough in this economy (Kletzer). In order to prepare people as much as possible, workplace training should be the focus as it is proven to fill in the gaps between school education and the skills necessary in a professional environment. Additionally, though it is a long-known problem, the current educational system

requires an overhaul more than ever to accommodate for these shifts in employment climate.

Points that should be prioritized include accessibility, affordability, and general quality of content provided to the students, which must be reflected in federal policies so that sufficient funding can back these proposals.

Current concerns over whether developments in AI will result in people losing their livelihoods entirely are grounded in real problems that are more prevalent than ever. Though technological advancement produces new job markets in the long term, the period in which we have to deal with greater disparities will only grow without change to our overall economic focus. Lest we truly end up in a robot-ruled dystopia, we must pay attention to the demographics that are most affected by the disruption to the employment climate and adjust accordingly, as well as improve on education and renew efforts to reskill our workforce. We may not be able to avoid the period in which we panic over a separate group taking over our jobs and the accompanying despair, but we can shorten it and better prepare for when conditions stabilize and job options become fairer.