Are editors of flesh and blood necessary for meeting yet another danger with AI?

Abstract

As a writer, it is hard to defend oneself from the accusation of being a robot. Even though the argument is *ad hominem* it perhaps is *too* difficult to create a "reversed" Turing test. It is suggested in this article that editors of flesh and blood still are necessary.

I have been exposed to a most unpleasant event. A reviewer on a preprint server thought that the article I had posted had been written by a robot. It is really ugly. Of course I will stop posting on that particular server but the article is published so I cannot submit it elsewhere. There are two lessons here. First, I would say that the argument is *ad hominem*. Second, we may need a "reversed" Turing test.

Arguments *ad hominem* have been banned for a long time in academic settings. Now they show their brutal faces again. It is not an easy thing to handle, though, since the inflation has a high price if we do not discriminate between humans and robots.

A "reversed" Turing test, also, may be impossible to create. We saw some of the difficulties portrayed in the movie "Blade Runner". What if the "human" is a robot? And so on and so forth.

In sum, perhaps, editors of flesh and blood are necessary. It slows things down but that may be the price for meeting yet another danger with AI.