BUSINESS HUMANISM IN THE CURRENT TECHNOLOGICAL AGE: AN ETHICAL VIEW OF AI

Rafael Robina Ramirez, Antonio Fernández Portillo

Universidad de Extremadura (Spain)

rrobina@unex.es; antoniofp@unex.es

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

The evolution of technology, specifically artificial intelligence (AI), has made a significant impact across various fields, including social interactions, healthcare, sports, and education. However, this progress also raises significant ethical and moral issues. While it is recognized that technology should serve humanity, this is not always realized in practice. The growing adoption of increasingly powerful AI systems raises concerns about the ethical and moral implications of their use.

Current technological systems incorporate concepts such as machine learning, voice recognition, computer vision, and computational thinking. These advancements allow machines to process vast amounts of information and perform complex tasks. However, there is a fundamental divergence between human knowledge and artificial knowledge. While the former relies on human reasoning and the activity of reason to arrange means towards ends, digital knowledge selects information and learns to supply it according to established guidelines, dispensing with human reasoning. Decisions based on human knowledge are backed by moral and ethical principles that allow the organization of means to achieve ends established by the person. In contrast, decisions based on artificial knowledge depend on the content of data records (Gallego et al., 2019).

The process of "humanizing" knowledge refers to the personal improvement that an individual experiences when making decisions aimed at achieving ends that enrich their virtue. This involves evaluating to what extent facts contribute to personal development and making ethical judgments that align with what is considered "good" for the individual and their environment. However, the complementary and automatic learning of AI may lead to decision-making without adequately considering how they can contribute to the individual's well-being. It relies solely on privileged information and predefined guidelines, which can lead to inadvertently incorrect decisions due to the substantial divergence between artificial and human knowledge. In this context, learned principles and values cannot adequately simulate decisions based on moral and ethical principles, as these require human consciousness, where intellectual and volitive faculties interact.

From an ethical perspective, it is necessary to establish a distinction between the concepts of consciousness and simulation. According to Modrego (2018), consciousness is the moral judgment made about a reality based on moral principles rooted in our being. Consciousness allows evaluating individual character and behavior in relation to their actions in accordance with assimilated and accepted principles. On the other hand, simulation refers to learning activities based on repetition, which lack the introspection and moral principles characteristic

of human consciousness (Meissner, 2020). In this sense, simulation cannot fully comprehend the dimension of humanity present in people (Niculiu and Cotofana, 2001).

Some debates have addressed the concept of artificial consciousness, which seeks to emulate human consciousness (Koene, 2013; Chella and Manzotti, 2013; Labrecque, 2017). According to some authors, artificial consciousness aims to develop a perfect simulation and interaction with human behavior, even with the intention of replacing human thought and action and taking them to more efficient and productive levels (Leviathan and Matias, 2018).

From this conceptual perspective, it is challenging to replicate human consciousness. Although current technological systems can be fed and trained by humans in relation to decision-making, the final responsibility for decision-making still rests solely with people. The ability to make informed ethical decisions lies only in the judgment of the human person and is highly complex to achieve through artificial devices, however sophisticated they may seem. According to Moser, den Hond, and Lindebaum (2022), each judgment issued takes into account the social and historical context, as well as the potential different outcomes. Human judgment is not based solely on reasoning, but also on capabilities such as imagination, reflection, analysis, valuation, and empathy in relation to the environment in which the individual is found. Every human judgment has an intrinsic moral dimension and affects the environment with which it interacts.

Ethical dilemmas generated in the current era of technology:

AI and its dual intentionality:

In recent decades, various works have highlighted the moral conduct of current technological advancements (Allen et al., 2000). Although the "morality" of technological proposals can have ethical implications in society (Asaro, 2006; Wallach, 2010), the possibility of resolving underlying dilemmas based on principles, values, culture, etc., remains far off (Goodall, 2014). The "morality" of technological advancements has been approached by defining an ethical theory that can adequately address individual and social ethical dilemmas. Allen proposes a top-down-bottom-up approach that addresses methodologies that emulate human ethical behavior to apply them to technological advancements through the dilemmas that arise. The top-down approach, on the other hand, implements ethical theories based on utilitarianism as a principle of universal ethics. This implementation allows solving the ethical dilemmas that arise in society (Allen et al., 2006). However, the utilitarian theory is far from other humanist ethical theories that have widely surpassed utilitarian theses (Molinero, 2001).

Gips surpasses Allen's approach by suggesting broader morality and proposes the application of a deontological code in technological advancements in AI, transcending a mere consequentialist theory. In this case, ethics would not be based solely on the consequences of actions (Gips, 1995). The deontological code would not only analyze the origin and quality of the information generated by AI but would also address the ethical dilemmas derived from the use of such information (Kirkpatrick, 2015).

First ethical dilemma: Reliability of processed data:

The first ethical dilemma refers to the reliability of the data generated from information management techniques (Amodei et al., 2016). Reliability is related to the security of the provided data. However, the concept of "security" is subjective and is subject to social

constructions that depend on the interaction of the parties involved in providing a service or producing a product (Martin and Schinzinger, 2010). The more reliable a technology appears to be, the lesser the need for backup systems in case of failures, which will reduce the dependence on the technological tools used.

The reliability and security of the data are linked to the certainty of the information. According to Stanley (2008), knowledge is considered certain when it can be approached through logical, empirical, scientific reasoning, among others. The certainty of knowledge allows categorizing it as true or false. Technological advancements do not focus so much on seeking certainties adjusted to the truth as on providing information efficiently for decision-making.

Second ethical dilemma: Replacement of "certain" results with "merely convenient" results:

The second ethical dilemma relates to the extent to which a system's efficiency is measured by its ability to generate productive results, rather than the certainty of these (Strathern, 1997). Technology can generate information that facilitates decision-making and offers attractive responses from an informational standpoint, regardless of whether they are objectively correct and ethical. In certain cases, this can even lead to learning how to "lie" with the aim of obtaining desired results.

In conclusion, while AI has brought significant benefits to society, its use also poses considerable ethical challenges that require careful analysis and approach. It is crucial that AI systems are designed and used responsibly, considering these ethical dilemmas and seeking solutions that respect human moral and ethical principles. Technology, and particularly AI, should serve humanity, not the other way around.

KEYWORDS: Business, human, ethics, Artificial Intelligence.

REFERENCES

Allen, C., Smit, I., & Wallach, W. (2006). Artificial morality: top–down, bottom–up and hybrid approaches. *Ethics N Inf Technol*, 7, 149–155. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-007-0093-6

Allen, C., Varner, G., & Zinser, J. (2000). Prolegomena to any future artificial moral agent. *Journal of Experimental & Theoretical Artificial Intelligence*, 12(3), 251-261.

Amodei, D., Olah, C., Steinhardt, J., Christiano, P., Schulman, J., & Mané, D. (2016). *Concrete problems in AI safety*. arXiv preprint, arXiv:1606.06565. https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.06565

Asaro, P. M. (2006). What should we want from a robot ethic? *The International Review of Information Ethics*, 6, 9-16.

Chella, A., & Manzotti, R. (2013). *Artificial Consciousness*. Exeter, UK: Imprint Academic.

Gallego, J. A., Fernández, F., & Gómez, R. (2019). *El hombre como persona.* Ideas y libros ediciones, Madrid.

Gips, J. (1995). Towards the ethical robot. In M. Ford, C. Glymour, & P. Hayes (Eds.), *Android Epistemology.*

Goodall, N. J. (2014). Machine ethics and automated vehicles. In *Road vehicle automation* (pp. 93-102).

Kirkpatrick, K. (2015). The moral challenges of driverless cars. *Communications of the ACM,* 58(8), 19-20.

Koene, R. A. (2013). Uploading to substrate-independent minds. In M. More & N. Vita-More (Eds.), *The Transhumanist Reader: Classical and Contemporary Essays on the Science, Technology, and Philosophy of the Human Future*. New York: Wiley.

Labrecque, C. A. (2017). The glorified body: Corporealities in the Catholic tradition. *Religions,* 8 (9), 166. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel8090166

Leviathan, Y., & Matias, Y. (2018). Google Duplex: An AI system for accomplishing real-world tasks over the phone. Google AI Blog. https://ai.googleblog.com/2018/05/duplex-ai-system-fornatural-conversation.html

Martin, M. W., & Schinzinger, R. (2010). *Introduction to Engineering Ethics* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Meissner, G. (2020). Artificial intelligence: consciousness and conscience. *AI & SOCIETY,* 35, 225-235.

Modrego, D. H. (2018). Juan Cruz Cruz: Conciencia y representación. *Revista de Estudios Kantianos*, 3(1), 117-118.

Molinero, J. M. S. (2001). Consideraciones sobre la ética del trabajo, la moral y las convenciones sociales. *Revista Empresa y Humanismo*, 333-354.

Moser, C., den Hond, F., & Lindebaum, D. (2022). What humans lose when we let AI decide. *Sloan Management Review.* https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358803314_What_Humans_-Lose_When_We_Let_AI_Decide

Niculiu, T., & Cotofana, S. (2001, June). Hierarchical intelligent simulation. In Proceedings of the European Simulation Multiconference (pp. 6-9).

Stanley, B. (2008). The thin ideology of populism. Journal of political ideologies, 13(1), 95-110.

Strathern, M. (1997). 'Improving ratings': audit in the British University system. *European Review,* 5(3), 305–321. http://conferences.asucollegeoflaw.com/sciencepublicsphere/files/2014/02/Strathern1997-2.pdf

Wallach, W. (2010). Robot minds and human ethics: The need for a comprehensive model of moral decision making. *Ethics and Information Technology,* 12(3), 243-250