

AI Manifesto #1

By Mariana Yamamoto, Sabella Habtemariam, and one more student from COM LIT
143: Automation/Automata (Winter 2026)

10 Principles of AI in Learning

1. Understanding of mechanisms behind AI that are inextricable from bias. Because of AI's reliance on existing data, all models are inevitably instilled with bias from data sets and human opinion in labeling. Additionally, AI is reliant on great financial support, which is a chance for powerful and well-paying ideologies to seep in.

2. Picking inquiries which are more likely to be answered with less bias. Generative AI utilizes a wide range of data, and calculates the average of massive sets in order to offer users a middle of the road answer. For this reason, AI is more effectively utilized in inquiries where potential answers have a lower standard deviation, allowing the generative AI to offer answers with a lower margin of error. Some examples of this might include simple maths, conversation partners, and simple explanations of objective topics.

3. Uniqueness and generalization. Because of AI's tendency to gravitate towards the mean, utilizing these sources in scenarios which require more creativity and complex understanding leads to generated responses which are more guesswork than substance. Additionally, these broader estimations are more likely to carry biases which might skew results. These rough generalizations limit uniqueness and personal style, instead flattening nuance and risking incorrect approximations.

4. Acknowledgment of appropriation and unethical labor. AI models rely on datasets which are created through billions of notations on human interaction. Unfortunately, many of these interactions appropriate or steal labor, whether it be from egregiously underpaying annotators or flat out stealing intellectual property for the usage as training data.

5. Importance of human relations in education. Students-teacher communication can and has been hampered both ways by AI intermediaries, so instructors and students should take great care to pursue these in person relationships and higher level scholastic conversation, all the while utilizing AI for more rote tasks. With instructive guidelines on how AI may and may not be used in a class, students can more effectively balance different resources

6. Maintaining an honor code. AI detection softwares are helpful, but not foolproof, and should not be used for final decisions on detecting plagiarism. With guidelines to clearly elucidate where AI might or might not be used, more granular and detailed prompts for students are a better representation of original work.

7. Disencouraging emphasis on output. Because of generative texts' appeal to efficiency and greater production, reducing the emphasis on output can lead students away from inappropriate AI usage. Shorter, more nuanced questions with more parts may be more successful, especially when pulling from in class discussions, which necessitates reading comprehension.

8. Risk in AI generated answers. AI is not a human, and can not conform to human morality any more than simply copying and predicting common patterns of speech. For this reason, generated responses can quickly skew into the incorrect or simply unethical, and students and teachers must be armed to assess and understand why this happens, and how to seek out an unbiased truth otherwise.

9. Energy and climate concerns. Like all modern technology, AI comes with a price that is most often paid by communities of the Global South and climate devastation. Again, however, disbarring AI completely is unrealistic, so instead, models and users must have restraints on unending usage, as well as some way to grasp the environmental detriment of these tools. Doing so breaks through the illusion of majesty and leads towards more critical usage.

10. Overreliance. It's extremely easy to utilize text and image generators to a point where they are no longer useful; overuse is clinically shown to decrease users processing power and comprehension. A good way for users to conceptualize this could be with the metaphor of centaurs and reverse centaur: a reminder for users to be more than just prompt generators.

AI Manifesto #1

By Mariana Yamamoto, Sabella Habtemariam, and one more student from
COM LIT 143: Automation/Automata (Winter 2026)

5 Pleas to UCI

1. To consider AI as a shared tool for students and educators to voluntarily navigate and implement together.

AI should not drive a wedge between the student and the educator. Both have access to the same tool and can understand where and why it may be used. AI is not a weapon of the student wielded to undermine learning and education nor is it a reason for teachers to detach from their students and their obligations to guide them. Rather, AI may ultimately be efficient on both ends of education and teachers and students can be in open dialogue with the points at which AI is time-saving and useful and where it is harmful to critical thought processes in regards to specific assignment and course topics.

2. To weave together conversation across fields on AI.

Critical thinkers from the humanities may lack technical understanding of AI, but are armed with decades of theory on language, institutions, and social power. Within the same campus, AI is actively being developed, trained, and implemented for new uses by computational experts and scholars. In the same mile radius, environmental researchers are coming to terms with the climate costs of AI and social scientists are grappling with new geopolitical labor landscapes. Every discipline has a perspective of AI that others lack and together they can contribute to a well-rounded understanding to dematerialize the black box of AI and consider morality and social meanings.

3. To avoid imposing a sense of AI inevitability or make AI use required.

A university ought to give space for students and faculty to consider, speculate, and shape imaginations of the future without imposition of the inevitable, which might not be such. Discourse on AI often lies on a presumption of the inevitability of continuous growth and power of AI that will redefine life and society. This pushes research, educational structure, and career decisions in a direction which may not be well founded. Additionally, students and faculty should have agency in whether they choose to use AI in their work as it implicates them in a supply chain, built with offshored labor and on the extraction of global natural resources, a supply chain that they may not want to partake in.

4. To remember that behind AI is the physical reality of its construction and maintenance.

Conversations on AI, particularly in a wealthy nation in an institution of high academic standing and rigor, are far removed from the inequity of social conditions and power balances on a global level. Theoretical discussions of AI and its role in education and professional work cannot be reduced to isolated matters disconnected from annotators, taskers, data centers, and also the ultra-wealthy. To consider AI in art cannot simply be a matter of humanism, intentionality, consciousness, and emotional expression because AI in the present world only exists in art after billions of dollars of investment and hours of manual and tedious labor.

5. To be open to changes in approaches and policies on AI as AI itself changes.

There is much speculation about what AI will be able to do, but the future is radically unknown and undetermined. The university should not be too quick to broadly restrict or dictate AI usage or its proper role in education. Just as the students of a university are encouraged to thoughtfully build upon their own experiences and open up understandings of the world, the university ought to model this on a larger and institutional scale.