

A case for a new pronoun for AI

Artificial Intelligence (AI) chatbots are having a seminal moment. Large Language Models (LLMs) are fuelling chatbots that converse like human experts, sometimes doing a better job than the best of us in summarising a complex idea or writing an essay. ChatGPT's bulleted response reminds us of examination answers by A-grade students.

While Internet search required us to learn the art of keywords, LLMs require us to master prompts. Prompts are archetype user-generated questions as well as instructions by software programmers which elicit a desired response from the algorithm. Prompt engineering is becoming a sought-after job to train Chatbots to act more like efficient human beings.

Computer scientist Alan Turing had proposed an imitation game to test a machine's ability to demonstrate intelligent behaviour that is indistinguishable from that of a human. In our willing suspension of disbelief, will we forget that we are conversing with a machine? Yes, on some occasions, we will anthropomorphise the model. On other occasions, we will simply not know, and the machine would have passed the Turing test. Even if we do not fall into an emotional or financial trap, anthropomorphous chatbots will muddy our sense of reality.

Giving AI a gender

Lawmakers are divided over the question of attributing a legal personhood to AI. This becomes more complicated with autonomous machines. But there is consensus that misrepresentation of identity by AI feels like manipulation. Experts suggest that restricting AI from using first person pronouns as well as other human pronouns may reduce cases of AI's mistaken identity. This way, it would be easier to identify text entirely produced by a machine. This is important because pronouns have everything to do with identity today.

Writers like me struggle with using pronouns



Shalini Verma

is an entrepreneur and writer

Artificial Intelligence requires pronouns to establish an identity that is distinct from that of humans, and it is a right, for ethical and security reasons, to know that a person is dealing with a bot

for AI in their writing. I tend to use the inanimate pronoun 'it', even as 'it' is no longer strictly used for inanimate nouns. Fiction writers lean on conventional gender-based pronouns for AI characters that are scripted as self-aware. Yet, in the real world, AI is no sentient being. Therefore, AI can easily avoid using 'I' in the first person. Even ChatGPT believes that 'giving AI a distinct identity can help clarify its role and prevent it from being confused with human beings'. We also need to avoid attributing gender-based second and third person pronouns to AI.

Apple typecast Siri in a feminine sounding voice. Although Siri has alternative masculine and gender-neutral voices, the default is feminine. We give AI a gender to foster an emotional connection with users. In the long run, this would reap the benefits of greater engagement, and hence, a robust revenue stream. Historically, the pronoun 'he' was loosely attributed to any student, which tended to create a mental image of a male student. The initial version of Siri in its default mode betrayed our gender assumptions about a preference for a more submissive feminine assistant.

Nevertheless, technology companies are cautious with pronouns. Google's Smart Compose technology, which auto-completes sentences on Gmail, is careful not to predict pronouns, to avoid exposing unconscious gender biases in the AI model. Google dismissed an employee who famously claimed that his AI model had become sentient and had preferred pronouns.

AI need not have gender. Some argue that AI should use a gender-neutral pronoun such as 'it' or 'they'. This will depersonalise AI. Yet, a non-binary identity may be construed as non-inclusive. Giving AI a contemporary pronoun would trigger popular demand for more diversity in chatbots, as was the case with avatars and emojis. Besides, AI requires pronouns to establish an identity that is distinct from that of humans.

Presumably, for ethical and security reasons, it is our right to know that we are indeed conversing with a bot.

In the English language, pronouns have evolved based on changes in cultural norms. 'You' started to be used for singular and plural second person pronouns from the early modern period, when social interactions became less formal. In literature, the first known use of "they" as a singular gender-neutral pronoun was in a 14th century French poem.

Historically, we were not entirely satisfied with the pronouns used at the time. There have been brief attempts at inventing and using a gender-neutral third-person singular pronoun such as 'thon' in the 1880s – meaning 'that one'. Kelly Ann Sippell's thesis in 1991 has a long list of gender-neutral pronouns in singular third person that were proposed in the past 150 years. These include hes, hiser, hem, ons, e, heer, he'er, hesh, se, heesh, herim, co, tey, per, na, en, herm, em, hir, and shey. This is not even a complete list.

Use in the technology industry

Pronoun usage has entered the technology industry discourse in recent times, especially as models become sophisticated enough to pass the Turing test. Suggestions include using the first-person neopronouns such as 'xe' or 'ze'. But they are already used by people who identify as gender neutral. Therefore, we should invent an entirely different set of pronouns for AI.

Regulators should not squander the opportunity to fix this problem at this early stage before conventional pronouns for AI catch on. To have a structured approach, regulators need to work with lexicographers and linguists to set a standard for the major languages to start with. Mandates related to pronouns can then be added to style guides for prompt engineering of AI models. Arguably, even if we were to lose an emotional connection with AI, we would build a trusted and transparent online environment.

Dilemmas of India's great power ambitions

“What kind of a global power will India be?” There are those who argue that India should aspire to be a great power and assert its growing power internationally; others argue that India should focus on the uplift of millions of its people above the poverty line, improve governance and reconcile within the country before venturing into making a better world.

It is a false binary. Notwithstanding the (equally faulty) hyper-nationalist and deeply-pessimistic narratives, the story of the rise of India, and the attendant challenges, must be proactively and critically engaged – for the kind of power India would become will not only define the future of the world in important ways, but, most definitely, shape the destiny of its 1.4 billion (and growing) citizens.

Ignoring or dismissing the global consequences of a rising India's power is unwise, but doing so without being rooted in the realities of the country's inherent limitations would be a strategic blunder.

Power and its consequences

Let us start with the India of 1991 – a weak, poor, and deeply beleaguered country with a foreign exchange reserve of \$5.8 billion and a nominal GDP of \$270.11 billion. For a population of 846 million, around 50% of whom were poor, those were miserable figures. Despite efforts to diffuse fears of a nuclear war, prospects of an India-Pakistan clash loomed, and violence in Kashmir was at its peak. The collapse of India's trusted partner, the Soviet Union on the one hand, and strained relations with the United States on the other further weighed on the country's ruling elite. American officials kept a close watch on India and Pakistan and their nuclear plans, and occasionally travelled to the subcontinent to counsel the cantankerous neighbours.

Fast forward three decades to 2023. India's foreign exchange reserve has grown to around \$600 billion, and a war with Pakistan is not something Indian leaders lose sleep over – China has taken that place though – and there is a general sense of foreign policy optimism. The reforms initiated after the 1991 economic crisis not only led to higher GDP growth but also significant poverty reduction.

Ranked as the world's fifth largest economy, India's nominal GDP could soon touch \$4 trillion; it has one of the largest militaries in the world with over a hundred nuclear weapons. The U.S. is now one of India's closest friends, and New Delhi enjoys strong relationships with several powerful states around the world. The visionary investments made over the past several decades are now beginning to bear fruit with a permissive



Happyman Jacob
teaches at the School of International Studies, Jawaharalal Nehru University, New Delhi, and is the founder of Council for Strategic and Defence Research

Even though domestic inabilities will continue to moderate New Delhi's ability to influence the world order, being unwilling to be a 'global rule shaper' would be a strategic blunder

external atmosphere for the country's rise.

India is also one of the pivotal swing powers of the contemporary international system, strategically located, and often playing both sides with great élan. The great power politics around the Ukraine war brought renewed focus on India's role in world politics. The U.S. and the wealthy West want India to be on their side. An embattled Russian Federation is doing everything it can to ensure India does not turn its back on Moscow. There are serious suggestions that India should mediate between Ukraine and Russia to bring an end to the war.

New Delhi, increasingly, uses the language of mediation in global crises and being a bridge between the north and south and east and west, indirectly indicating that it is a major 'pole' in world politics. Although tens of millions of people in India still live in poverty, the country's national power has increased dramatically, making it a force with system-shaping capabilities and intentions. Whether New Delhi is actually punching above its weight or not is something only time will tell.

Other side of the great power story

Despite being the fifth largest economy in the world, its GDP per capita was \$1,947 in 2021 whereas that of Bangladesh, at \$2,227, was more than that of India even though Bangladesh is only the 40th largest military in the world. The argument from this comparison is a well-known one: GDP and military strength do not equal the well-being of a country's citizens. But at the same time, the well-being of a country's population does not equal to the gross material power that a state can bring to bear in its foreign and security policies.

India is also beset with major infrastructural and governance issues: ease of doing business may have improved, but starting a business without a bribe is still not easy. A few days of rain brings the national capital to its knees, year after year. Regional, caste, ethnic and religious divisions run deep. India's domestic challenges will continue to distract the attention of its political leaders from attending to global problems. For the Indian politician, foreign policy is a luxury she/he cannot afford.

One of the most pressing concerns for India's political class is to reduce poverty and improve the well-being of millions of Indians living under the poverty line, a task that is bound to divert its attention from serious external engagements. When the political class gives scant attention to the country's foreign and security policy, as it usually happens in the case of India, it is managed by career bureaucrats who usually do not diverge from precedents and avoid taking even remotely risky decisions. Without political

will, foreign policy tends to be on autopilot.

The presence of a weak economy also tempers the Indian elite's appetite for external engagement. Over time, the appetite has grown, but that does not change the fact that the political class can only allocate so much attention to foreign and security policies if the country is economically weak and large sections of the population are living in poverty.

More so, a weak domestic economy prevents politicians from allocating adequate resources for foreign policy objectives. For instance, the Parliamentary Committee on External Affairs (2022-23) observed that “despite an increase in the overall budget allocation of the Government of India, the allocation made to MEA [the Ministry of External Affairs] in percentage terms has witnessed a downward turn during the last four years and during 2022-23 it is only 0.44% of the Government of India's overall Budget.” The committee further said we “do not find such allocation in consonance with the country's rising aspirations and growing global stature”. Perhaps the country is simply unable to do so.

The combined effect of such domestic challenges is likely to be a political elite distracted by more immediate domestic considerations rather than the grandeur of great power status.

Embrace power

So, should India refrain from shaping the global order until its domestic challenges are resolved, as the pessimists would have it? Or should India continue to assert its place in the world and aspire to be a great power?

Even though India's domestic inabilities will continue to moderate its ability to influence the world order befitting of its size and ambition, being unwilling to engage and shape it would be a strategic blunder. If you are not a rule shaper, you are a rule taker. India has no choice but to influence and shape the global order to meet its foreign policy objectives which would have significant impact on its economic growth, security environment and geopolitical and geo-economic interests. Be it debt restructuring, climate change, global trade or non-proliferation, New Delhi can ill afford to let someone else make the rules and abide by them. Whether it likes it or not, India's impact on the world order is a given, and, in a globalised world, the relationship between a state's global influence and domestic growth is an unavoidable one.

India's ability to shape international politics must also be a reflection of its domestic context, and its global engagement must necessarily be geared towards the well-being of its people. Neither is strategic autarky an option nor is India's assertiveness on the global stage a matter of nationalistic hubris or officious vanity.