Negative: Department of A.I.

By “Coach Vance” Trefethen

***Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reform the use of Artificial Intelligence technology***

Case Summary: The AFF plan creates a federal Dept. of AI to promote and develop AI in the US.
SEE ALSO THE MONUMENT GENERIC NEG BRIEF ON “FEDERAL RESEARCH”
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Negative: Department of A.I.

TOPICALITY

1. No reform, because it already exists

Pres. Trump established the National Artificial Intelligence Initiative Office in 2021 to do everything the AFF Plan does

Office of Science & Technology Policy 2021. (agency of the Executive Branch of the US federal government) “The White House Launches the National Artificial Intelligence Initiative Office” 12 Jan 20212 <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/briefings-statements/white-house-launches-national-artificial-intelligence-initiative-office/> (accessed 17 Mar 2022)

After recognizing the strategic importance of AI to the Nation’s future economy and security, the Trump Administration issued the [first ever national AI strategy](https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/American-AI-Initiative-One-Year-Annual-Report.pdf), committed to [doubling AI research investment](https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/briefings-statements/president-trumps-fy-2021-budget-commits-double-investments-key-industries-future/), established the first-ever [national AI research institutes](https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/articles/trump-administration-investing-1-billion-research-institutes-advance-industries-future/), released the world’s first [AI regulatory guidance](https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/articles/ai-that-reflects-american-values/), forged [new international AI alliances](https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/articles/artificial-intelligence-can-serve-democracy/), and established [guidance for Federal use of AI](https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/articles/promoting-use-trustworthy-artificial-intelligence-government/). Building upon this critical foundation, today the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) established the National Artificial Intelligence Initiative Office, further accelerating our efforts to ensure America’s leadership in this critical field for years to come. The Office is charged with overseeing and implementing the United States national AI strategy and will serve as the central hub for Federal coordination and collaboration in AI research and policymaking across the government, as well as with private sector, academia, and other stakeholders.

Violation: No substantial reform

Endorsing what the Status Quo is doing, or renaming what the Status Quo is doing, or doing a little more of what the Status Quo is doing – none of these are substantial reform.

Impact: If no one affirms the resolution, then a Negative ballot is warranted

There’s effectively no Affirmative team in the round because neither side is advocating substantial reform of AI. This means no matter who wins, you should vote Negative.

INHERENCY

1. A/T “Lack of national strategy”

Biden recently established new federal oversight agency for AI development strategy and resources

National Science Foundation 2021 (federal research agency) 10 June 2021 “The Biden administration launches the National Artificial Intelligence Research Resource Task Force” <https://www.nsf.gov/news/news_summ.jsp?cntn_id=302882&org=NSF> (accessed 17 June 2021)

The U.S. National Science Foundation and the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy today announced the formation of the National Artificial Intelligence Research Resource Task Force. As directed by Congress in the "National AI Initiative Act of 2020," the task force will serve as a federal advisory committee, developing an implementation roadmap for the National AI Research Resource, a shared research infrastructure providing AI researchers and students across all scientific disciplines with access to computational resources, high-quality data, educational tools and user support. The task force will provide recommendations for establishing and sustaining the National AI Research Resource, including technical capabilities, governance, administration, assessment and requirements for security, privacy, civil rights and civil liberties. It will also submit two reports to Congress that will comprise a comprehensive roadmap and implementation plan. The task force will deliver an interim report in May 2022 and a final report in November 2022.  “America’s economic prosperity hinges on foundational investments in our technological leadership,” said Science Advisor to the President and OSTP Director Eric Lander. “The National AI Research Resource will expand access to the resources and tools that fuel AI research and development, opening opportunities for bright minds from across America to pursue the next breakthroughs in science and technology.”

Federal government has a single overall framework for coordination of AI – the National AI Initiative Office

Allison Proffitt 2021 (journalist) “Federal Government Spending on AI is Accelerating” 7 Oct 2021 <https://dataintegration.info/federal-government-spending-on-ai-is-accelerating> (accessed 17 Mar 2022)

Also providing a push is the National AI Initiative Act, passed in 2020, which provides a framework for coordinating AI research and policy across federal departments. The bill creates the National AI Initiative Office and a network of institutes at the National Science Foundation, and departments of Energy and Commerce to encourage focused AI research related to mission-driven applications.  The Biden Administration in June announced with the NSF and White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) the formation of the national AI Research Resource Task Force, as reported in a [press release](https://www.nsf.gov/news/news_summ.jsp?cntn_id=302882&org=NSF)from the NSF. The task force will serve as a federal advisory committee to help develop an implementation roadmap for the National AI Research Resource, a shared research infrastructure providing AI researchers and students across all scientific disciplines with access to computational resources, high-quality data, educational tools and user support.

2. No shortage of funding

AI private sector research funding growing rapidly in Status Quo

David Jeans 2020 (journalist) 20 Oct 2020 “Companies Will Spend $50 Billion On Artificial Intelligence This Year With Little To Show For It” FORBES <https://www.forbes.com/sites/davidjeans/2020/10/20/bcg-mit-report-shows-companies-will-spend-50-billion-on-artificial-intelligence-with-few-results/?sh=60c777387c87> (accessed 16 March 2022)

 More than $50 billion is expected to be invested in AI systems globally this year, according to [IDC](https://www.idc.com/getdoc.jsp?containerId=prUS46794720), up from [$37.5 billion in 2019](https://www.idc.com/getdoc.jsp?containerId=prUS45481219). By 2024, investment is expected to reach $110 billion, IDC forecasts.

3. Multiple well-funded federal efforts already underway

American AI Initiative, Executive Order 13859, Select Committee on Artificial Intelligence, National AI Research Institutes, AI risk assessment framework, National AI Research Resource, and Industries of the Future Act

Office of Science & Technology Policy 2021. (agency of the Executive Branch of the US federal government) “The White House Launches the National Artificial Intelligence Initiative Office” 12 Jan 20212 <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/briefings-statements/white-house-launches-national-artificial-intelligence-initiative-office/> (accessed 17 Mar 2022)

The [American AI Initiative](https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/American-AI-Initiative-One-Year-Annual-Report.pdf), which was established via [Executive Order 13859](https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-maintaining-american-leadership-artificial-intelligence/), identified five key lines of effort that are now codified into law. These efforts include increasing AI research investment, unleashing Federal AI computing and data resources, setting AI technical standards, building America’s AI workforce, and engaging with our international allies.
The [Select Committee on Artificial Intelligence](https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Charter-Select-Committee-on-AI-Jan-2021-posted.pdf), launched by the White House in 2018 to coordinate Federal AI efforts, is being expanded and made permanent, and will serve as the senior interagency body referenced in the Act that is responsible for overseeing the National AI Initiative.
The [National AI Research Institutes](https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/articles/trump-administration-investing-1-billion-research-institutes-advance-industries-future/) announced by the White House and the National Science Foundation in 2020 were codified into law. These collaborative research and education institutes will focus on a range of AI R&D areas, such as machine learning, synthetic manufacturing, precision agriculture, and extreme weather prediction.
Regular updates to the national [AI R&D strategic plan](https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/National-AI-Research-and-Development-Strategic-Plan-2019-Update-June-2019.pdf), which were initiated by the White House in 2019, are codified into law.
Critical [AI technical standards](https://www.nist.gov/system/files/documents/2019/08/10/ai_standards_fedengagement_plan_9aug2019.pdf) activities directed by the White House in 2019 are expanded to include an AI risk assessment framework.
The [prioritization of AI related data, cloud, and high-performance computing](https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/articles/accelerating-americas-leadership-in-artificial-intelligence/) directed by the White House in 2019 are expanded to include a plan for a National AI Research Resource providing compute resources and datasets for AI research.
An [annual AI budget rollup](https://www.nitrd.gov/pubs/FY2020-NITRD-Supplement.pdf#page=17) of Federal AI R&D investments directed as part of the American AI Initiative is codified and made permanent to ensure that the balance of AI funding is sufficient to meet the goals and priorities of the National AI Initiative.
In addition, the bipartisan Industries of the Future Act recently passed by Congress requires a plan to double Federal AI R&D investment, codifying President Trump’s landmark 2021 [budget proposal](https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/briefings-statements/president-trumps-fy-2021-budget-commits-double-investments-key-industries-future/).

Impact: We can’t possibly imagine what else the AFF Plan could do that isn’t already being done

A Negative ballot gets you just as much AI development as an Affirmative ballot, so there’s no justification for this resolution.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. No real impact: AI is mostly hype

Big applications of AI don’t really work yet – it’s mostly hype and “fake it ‘til you make it”

Prof. Mary Cummings 2020 (*professor in the Duke University Electrical and Computer Engineering Department, and the Director of the Humans and Autonomy Laboratory)* The AI that Wasn’t There: Global Order and the (Mis)Perception of Powerful AI *) 2 June 2020* <https://tnsr.org/roundtable/policy-roundtable-artificial-intelligence-and-international-security/> (accessed 8 Aug 2021)

Despite the fact that AI has not been as successful in military and commercial settings as many people think, it is entirely possible that the perception of having all-powerful AI may be just as important as actually having it. A major factor driving the perception of who has the most advanced AI is who spends the most on it. Alphabet has spent more than $2 billion on DeepMind, which has a reputation as one of the most advanced AI companies in the world. However, DeepMind has produced very little in terms of revenue beyond successes in deterministic games like Alpha Go, calling into question DeepMind’s supposed successes.The uncertain accomplishments of AI are important when it comes to the international arms race because there is serious concern that China is outpacing the United States in AI applications. But given the significant weaknesses of current AI development, it must be asked whether China is really ahead of the United States in AI development or if AI overhype and well-placed demonstrations have simply given the perception that China is ahead. If the latter, what are the ramifications of such a misperception? The practice of claiming to possess all-powerful AI without actually having AI-driven systems is currently an issue in the commercial world of driverless cars. Companies developing driverless cars must rely on humans to significantly augment computer vision systems through data labelling: Humans must tell the car what it is seeing (road, bush, pedestrian, etc.), in the hope that after enough examples the car will “learn” these relationships on its own. As a result of the brittleness in such supervised approaches to learning, companies have not delivered on their promises of fleets of operational self-driving cars. To date, no company has demonstrated the ability for sustained driving operations without a safety driver behind the wheel. This practice of “fake it till you make it” is well known in Silicon Valley and has shown up in other commercial settings, like when humans pretended to be calendar-scheduling chatbots or when call center employees acted as transcription AI for voice-to-text translation.

AI is a lot of hype like a gold rush

Prof. Jason Mars 2021 (professor of computer science at the University of Michigan where he directs Clarity Lab, one of the world’s top AI and computing training labs ) 25 Mar 2022 “The Antidote To The Hype, Noise, And Spin Of Artificial Intelligence” <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesbooksauthors/2021/03/25/the-antidote-to-the-hype-noise-and-spin-of-artificial-intelligence/?sh=8b460f143cd2> (accessed 16 Mar 2022)

What went wrong with artificial intelligence? This transformative technology was supposed to change everything. I’ve seen first-hand the incredible potential it has—both as a professor of computer science at the University of Michigan and as the founder of Clinc, ZeroShotBot, Myca.ai, a non-profit called ImpactfulAI, and several other AI-focused companies. So, why has it devolved into overhyped solutions, marketing noise, and an endless spin of the same, tired ideas? Into poor user experiences, embarrassing bugs, and countless other misfires? The answer is pretty clear when you consider how every business has been told it needs artificial intelligence to stay competitive. This mad dash is symbolic of the gold rush, as companies push and pull to be early adopters—to scrape every last dollar out of their ROI.

3 quarters of business executives believe AI is more hype than reality

KPMG 2021. (global tax, audit and advisory consulting firm) KPMG survey finds execs worry about AI hype — but they can address it 26 May 2021 <https://venturebeat.com/2021/05/26/kpmg-survey-finds-execs-are-worried-about-ai-hype-but-they-can-overcome-it/> (accessed 16 Mar 2022)

AI is more hype, less reality, say three-quarters of the executives surveyed in a 2021 study by KPMG, “[Thriving in an AI World: Unlocking the Value of AI across 7 Industries](https://advisory.kpmg.us/articles/2021/thriving-in-an-ai-world.html).” And half think AI is [moving too fast](https://venturebeat.com/2021/05/12/new-kpmg-survey-says-ai-adoption-is-picking-up-speed-but-is-it-moving-too-fast/) in their industry, even as they wish their company was moving faster. The hurdles to implementing AI are high, from a fundamental misunderstanding of what AI actually is and what it can do, to the significant lack of expertise available to help AI-curious organizations get their footing, says Dr. Ellen Campana, head of enterprise AI at KPMG LLP. “The overhype is a real concern,” Campana says. “There are a lot of people trying to get into the game. Many have had a bad experience along the way, because they have put their trust in a group or person that didn’t have a lot of experience with AI, or they didn’t have a clear understanding of what to expect when launching an AI program.”

2. More funding doesn’t bring more results

AI private sector research funding growing, but only 10% of companies report any significant benefit

David Jeans 2020 (journalist) 20 Oct 2020 “Companies Will Spend $50 Billion On Artificial Intelligence This Year With Little To Show For It” FORBES <https://www.forbes.com/sites/davidjeans/2020/10/20/bcg-mit-report-shows-companies-will-spend-50-billion-on-artificial-intelligence-with-few-results/?sh=60c777387c87> (accessed 16 March 2022)

As corporate spending on artificial intelligence systems is set to pass $50 billion this year, the vast majority of companies may not be seeing much return on that record investment. In a survey of more than 3,000 company managers about their AI spend, only 10% reported significant financial benefits from their investment so far, the new [report](https://protect-us.mimecast.com/s/gdluCL9Ay3uV4XEViBqVxd?domain=bcg.com) from MIT Sloan Management Review and Boston Consulting Group found.

Increased funding and AI adoption don’t produce much impact

David Jeans 2020 (journalist) 20 Oct 2020 “Companies Will Spend $50 Billion On Artificial Intelligence This Year With Little To Show For It” FORBES <https://www.forbes.com/sites/davidjeans/2020/10/20/bcg-mit-report-shows-companies-will-spend-50-billion-on-artificial-intelligence-with-few-results/?sh=60c777387c87> (accessed 16 March 2022) (brackets added)

Gains from the tech haven’t kept pace with increased adoption, says Shervin Khodabandeh, who led the study and is co-head of BCG’s [Boston Consulting Group] AI business in North America. “We are seeing more activity, which also means more investment in technology and data science,” Khodabandeh says. “But that impact line hasn’t really changed.”

SOLVENCY

1. Federal fails

Federally funded R&D is less effective because it can’t correct its mistakes as fast as markets

Clyde Wayne Crews 2021 (MBA; vice president for policy and a senior fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute) 19 May 2021 The Endless Frontier Act to Boost Science and Tech Can Mean Endless Regulation https://cei.org/blog/the-endless-frontier-act-to-boost-science-and-tech-can-mean-endless-regulation/

Bureaucrats’ ability at spending others’ money is suspect. It puts the cart before the horse by short-circuiting the organic evolution of new technologies. Governments, unlike private sector investors, are also is incapable of rapid course correction, including abandoning unproductive projects. The Endless Frontier Act still has a way to go in terms of debate and amendment. Policy makers need to do a better job in addressing the downsides of government funding and oversight of frontier sectors. CEI’s founder Fred Smith has often noted the primacy of tying research and deployment to human needs, and how private investors are best situated to do that, able to test low-probability projects and letting the rare success offset multiple failures. Markets are good at killing bad projects.

Federal hi-tech R&D historically fails: 1) political intervention; 2) lack of knowledge; 3) crowding out private investment

Scott Lincicome 2021 (J.D.; senior visiting lecturer at Duke University Law School; senior fellow in economic studies at Cato Institute) 26 May 2021 “The ‘Endless Frontier’ and American Industrial Policy” <https://www.cato.org/commentary/endless-frontier-american-industrial-policy> (brackets in original) (accessed 24 June 2021)

Past U.S. industrial policy efforts show how public choice issues can thwart planners’ intentions, especially in the high‐​tech space. For example, in critiquing the Endless Frontier Act’s structure back in 2020, technology experts Patrick Windham, Christopher T. Hill, David Cheney [noted](https://issues.org/improving-the-endless-frontier-act/) that “US efforts in the 1990s to identify ‘critical technologies’ did not succeed, partly because it is hard to predict which technologies will be most valuable in the future [note: this “[Knowledge Problem](https://www.econlib.org/library/Essays/hykKnw.html)” is another common industrial policy hurdle] and partly because decisions about R&D funding priorities inevitably become political, as groups and leaders vie to have their favorites supported.”  Once legislation is passed, moreover, politics can still intervene. In the 1991 book, [The Technology Pork Barrel](https://www.brookings.edu/book/the-technology-pork-barrel/), for example, the authors—sympathetic to industrial policy—examined six federal programs from the 1960s and 1970s intended to develop commercial technologies for the private sector. They found that none were truly successful, while four were “almost unqualified failures,” costing billions, crowding out more meritorious R&D projects, yet enduring long after fiscal, technological, and commercial failure was established—a survival owed to political pressure (especially financial benefits accruing to numerous congressional districts) and captured regulators.

2. Talent deficit

US Government has big human talent deficit in AI. Can’t solve without an entirely new talent pipeline built from scratch

National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence 2021 (bipartisan commission of 15 technologists, national security professionals, business executives, and academic leaders) March 2021 “Final Report” <https://www.nscai.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Full-Report-Digital-1.pdf> (accessed 17 June 2021)

The human talent deficit is the government’s most conspicuous AI deficit and the single greatest inhibitor to buying, building, and fielding AI-enabled technologies for national security purposes. This is not a time to add a few new positions in national security departments and agencies for Silicon Valley technologists and call it a day. We need to build entirely new talent pipelines from scratch.

3. Real barriers unsolved

Real barriers to AI development and adoption are elsewhere, outside scope of AFF Plan

David Jeans 2020 (journalist) 20 Oct 2020 “Companies Will Spend $50 Billion On Artificial Intelligence This Year With Little To Show For It” FORBES <https://www.forbes.com/sites/davidjeans/2020/10/20/bcg-mit-report-shows-companies-will-spend-50-billion-on-artificial-intelligence-with-few-results/?sh=60c777387c87> (accessed 16 March 2022) (brackets added)

But despite the billions invested, failed AI projects have become an increasing factor. IBM has deprioritized its Watson technology after drawing [scorn](https://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewherper/2017/02/19/md-anderson-benches-ibm-watson-in-setback-for-artificial-intelligence-in-medicine/#5a995f963774) for ventures like one $62 million oncology project that made inaccurate suggestions on cancer treatments. Amazon [canned](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-amazon-com-jobs-automation-insight/amazon-scraps-secret-ai-recruiting-tool-that-showed-bias-against-women-idUSKCN1MK08G) an AI recruitment tool after it showed misogynistic biases. And smaller businesses have found that building the technology is harder than it looks, as supposedly AI-powered virtual assistants and meetings schedulers [end up relying on actual humans](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-04-18/the-humans-hiding-behind-the-chatbots?sref=XyREfyGf) behind the scenes.  Companies are struggling to deliver on AI projects, Khodabandeh says, because they overspend on technology and data scientists, without implementing changes in the business processes that could benefit from AI — a conclusion that echoes a [Harvard Business Review](https://hbr.org/2020/06/the-dumb-reason-your-ai-project-will-fail) report published in June.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Hype wastes money

AI is the latest hype that will end up wasting a lot of money because it will achieve far less than promised

Adam Lashinsky 2019 (journalist) 22 Jan 2019 “Artificial Intelligence: Separating the Hype from Reality” FORTUNE magazine <https://fortune.com/2019/01/22/artificial-intelligence-ai-reality/> (accessed 16 Mar 2022)

**Like bees to honey**, tech trends generate hype. Merely appending the word “dotcom” to a company’s name drove up stock prices in the Internet’s salad days. Cloud computing, big data, and cryptocurrencies each have taken their turn in the hype cycle in recent years. Every trend brings genuinely promising technological developments, befuddling buzzwords, enthusiastic investors, and reassuring consultants offering enlightenment—for a fee, naturally. Now the catchall phrase of artificial intelligence is shaping up as the defining technological trend of the moment. And yet, because the claims of what it will achieve are so grand, businesses risk raising their hopes for A.I. too high—and wasting money by trying to apply the technology to problems it can’t solve.

Impact: Every dollar wasted on this plan raises the federal deficit, which harms the economy

Dr William Gale and Benjamin Harris 2010. (Gale - PhD in economics, Stanford Univ.; senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and co-director of the Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center; former assistant professor of Economics at UCLA, and a senior economist for the Council of Economic Advisers under President George H.W. Bush; Harris - master’s degree in economics from Cornell Univ and master’s degree in quantitative methods from Columbia University; senior research associate with the Economics Studies Program at the Brookings Institution) “A VAT for the United States: Part of the Solution” (notes about the date: This article is one of several in the overall publication at this source. The publication date was 2011, but this article was written in 2010) https://www.taxpolicycenter.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/1001418-A-Value-Added-Tax-for-the-United-States-Part-of-the-Solution.PDF (accessed 26 Jan 2022)

But even in the absence of a crisis, sustained deficits have deleterious effects, as they translate into lower national savings, higher interest rates, and increased indebtedness to foreign investors, all of which serve to reduce future national income. Gale and Orszag (2004a) estimate that a 1 percent of GDP increase in the deficit will raise interest rates by 25 to 35 basis points and reduce national saving by 0.5 to 0.8 percentage points of GDP.

2. AI Winter

Link: AFF hypes the supposedly essential need for AI and the supposedly huge consequences of having or not having it

Hype is the basis of the Affirmative’s case. They’re not here telling you that AI is a nice thing to have and we ought to quietly let the Status Quo keep working on it. That’s the Negative’s position. The Affirmative says it’s a big deal and we need to get excited and do big things NOW or else... But that’s bad because of our second sub-point:

The Brink: AI is right now on the brink of the arrival of “AI winter” – a rejection that comes from being fooled again by all the hype into pouring bazillions of dollars into something that can’t live up to the hype

[Janis Stöckle](https://www.hiig.de/en/author/jstoeckle/) 2019. (Student Assistant: Innovation & Entrepreneurship, Humboldt Institute for Internet and Society) 18 June 2019 “AI in the Hype Cycle: A Brief History of AI” <https://www.hiig.de/en/a-brief-history-of-ai-ai-in-the-hype-cycle/amp/> (accessed 17 Mar 2022)

At the moment, AI is experiencing another hype phase, which has even led to[a race for AI](https://www.hiig.de/der-globale-wettlauf-um-kuenstliche-intelligenz/) in which states try to outbid each other with strategies and funding programmes. AI is regarded by politicians and investors worldwide as the central key technology of the future. In its “[National AI Strategy](https://www.bmbf.de/files/Nationale_KI-Strategie.pdf)“, for example, the German Federal Government calls for “Germany and Europe to become a leading location for the development and application of AI technologies” and intends to invest billions in the research and development of such technologies. AI obviously serves the leading technological powers as means or at least as a metaphor to demonstrate technological, but often also – in the form of lethal autonomous weapon systems – military power. At the same time, it is unclear to what extent the political ambitions are bearing real fruit.[A recent study](https://www.gruenderszene.de/technologie/studie-ki-startups?interstitial) showed that four out of ten European start-ups labelled AI do not use any AI technologies based on the analysis of large amounts of data. So, are expectations produced again in the current hype that cannot be met? It is quite possible that in the current cycle – to remain in the language of the seasons – we are already in late summer and a new AI winter is threatening.

Link: AI winter means the public turns against it when they discover it doesn’t live up to the hype, and programs get eliminated, budgets get cut, and AI efforts are abandoned

[Janis Stöckle](https://www.hiig.de/en/author/jstoeckle/) 2019. (Student Assistant: Innovation & Entrepreneurship, Humboldt Institute for Internet and Society) 18 June 2019 “AI in the Hype Cycle: A Brief History of AI” <https://www.hiig.de/en/a-brief-history-of-ai-ai-in-the-hype-cycle/amp/> (accessed 17 Mar 2022)

In its eventful history, dating back to the 1950s, the research field of artificial intelligence (AI) has experienced several ups and downs. Sometimes the technology went through a phase of hype and governments invested enormous sums of public funding in the development and research of these technologies. Sometimes the interest of the public and politics in the topic decreased and funding was withheld from AI research. An essential role behind these ups and downs was often played by exaggerated expectations, which eventually ended in disappointment.
In 1973 the British AI research community was shocked.[A report](http://www.chilton-computing.org.uk/inf/literature/reports/lighthill_report/p001.htm) commissioned by the British Parliament confirmed that the field of research had achieved virtually none of its objectives in recent years. As a result, AI research projects were ceased and funds cut. Not only in Europe, but also in the USA, public funding of civil AI research almost came to a standstill. The US Congress passed a law restricting the funding of basic research without a direct military connection.
**The seasons of AI**The events in the early 70s are today referred to as the first AI winter.

Impact: Turn the AFF’s harms or advantages – their plan actually backfires and reduces AI long-term

If you think more development of AI is a good thing, the best way to get it is with a Negative ballot. The AFF plan will ultimately result in public disappointment and turning away from it. Slow and steady wins the race, and that’s the Status Quo and Negative position in this round.