THIS IS OUTRAGEOUS. I'M SHOCKED. SHOCKED! SCHRÖDINGER's HYPOTHETICAL DEMANDS HIS CAT USES AI

Christopher Barnett[a], Thomas Maschmeyer[a], Anthony Masters[a], Alexander Yuen[a].

Presenting Author: Anthony Masters (anthony.masters@sydney.edu.au)
[a]Laboratory of Advanced Catalysis for Sustainability, School of Chemistry, The University of Sydney, NSW, 2006, Australiay

KEYWORDS: AI, critical thinking, student engagement

SUBTHEME: Modes of Learning

ABSTRACT

"*This is a time, Gentlemen, when … the Sciences, in the largest sense of the word, are looked upon with anxiety …*" (Newman, 1855).
That's arguably truer now than 170 years ago. To gain and keep the confidence of Joe and Josephine Public, the students we turn into scientists must learn to critically assess the information available to them. T'was ever so. But this critical ability and curiosity as to the source and quality of information has become even more important in our current age of a huge and ever-increasing volume of easily accessible uncurated and untested information. Why should we bother with scientists when AI can give us the answer?

In this presentation we aim to illustrate the pernicious potential of AI to rewrite the history of our discipline (in this case, chemistry) by discussing a seemingly simple example in which not only is AI slavishly incurious, merely mouthing the platitudes, pouring lemming-like across the internet, but, in an Orwellian twist, rewrites history in a way that supports the AI interpretation.

What to do? We present some simple examples drawn from chemistry which encourage students to engage with the primary data.

REFERENCES

Newman, J. H. C., (1855) Christianity and Scientific Investigation, A Lecture Written for the School of Science. In *The Idea of a University*, Svaglic, M. J., Ed. University of Notre Dame Press: 1982; pp 343-361