

The turning point of civilization: Sociological perspective toward artificial intelligence on modern humanity

Mansurni Abadi^{1*}, Rajih Arraki², Anna Podara³, Tatevik Ghazaryan⁴, Ahmad Mufid⁵

¹Institute of Ethnic Studies, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bandar Baru Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia 43600

²Department of Sociology, FISIP, Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Jl. Raya Tlogomas No. 246 Malang, Jawa Timur, Indonesia 65144

³School of Journalism, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Vasileos Irakleiou 12, Thessaloniki, Greece 54625

⁴Faculty of Information Technology, University of Yerevan, 1 Alek Manukyan St, Yerevan, Armenia 0025

⁵Islamic Education Studies Program, Post-graduate Center, Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan, Jl. Zainal Abidin, Pagar Alam, Labuhan Ratu, Bandar Lampung, Lampung, Indonesia 35141

*Corresponding author

E-mail address: murytech@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21107/sml.v6i2.22808>

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
artificial
intelligence
creation
sentiment
consciousness
sociological
perspective

ABSTRACT

The ongoing debate about whether artificial intelligence (AI) is a gift or a curse to humanity is explored in this study from a sociological perspective. The study examines how AI simplifies human work but devalues creativity, intuition, emotion, and consciousness, ultimately transforming society. The research suggests that while the challenges of AI can be overcome, three aspects of human cognition are difficult to replace: curiosity, humility, and emotional intelligence. On a social level, AI cannot replace initiatives for cooperation, cultural awareness, and encouragement to be part of society (sense of socialization). The study emphasizes the need for values, rules, and discourse. AI must be based on human rights, democracy, inclusion and diversity. It strengthens and enhances the discourse and practice of digital humanism and post-humanism. It also highlights the importance of incorporating religious values, local wisdom, and rules or policies to mitigate and resolve AI risks. The conclusion is that AI is not inherently a threat to humanity, but rather the greatest threat is humanity itself. The research emphasizes the need for collective feedback and understanding to improve AI systems through collaboration, as the road is long, full of surprises, and challenges.

Citation suggestion:

Abadi, M., Arraki, R., Podara, A., Ghazaryan, T., & Mufid, A. (2023). The turning point of civilization: Sociological perspective toward artificial intelligence on modern humanity. *Simulacra*, 6(2), 293-310. <https://doi.org/10.21107/sml.v6i2.22808>

Received 31 October 2023; Received in revised form 9 November 2023; Accepted 11 November 2023; Published online 25 November 2023.

Introduction

Have you not heard the term "artificial intelligence," commonly shortened to "AI"? If this is your initial experience hearing about these, have you never tested AI? Are you familiar with or have you utilized applications such as Grammarly, Quillbot, or ChatGPT? Does it not spark interest? Also, were you entertained when the president sang your favorite song? Are you one of the individuals who enjoy online shopping? You have subconsciously recalled all this and are amazed that AI-powered software and apps are managing your daily social media, web searches, online stores and services, digital assistants, and recommendations, both consciously and unconsciously, as per Campbell (2022).

The rapid development of artificial intelligence is shaping modern civilization and influencing millions of lives globally. Yeh et al. (2021) posit that AI is poised to revolutionize various aspects of our lives, while Thomas Ramge's book 'Who's Afraid of AI? Fear and Promise in the Age of Thinking Machine' (2018) explores how the increasing intelligence of machines is causing a fundamental shift in the relationship between humans and machines. According to Max Tegmarx (2013) in "Life 3.0: Being Human in the Age of Artificial Intelligence", Artificial Intelligence (AI) has transformed our civilization into a Life 3.0 that is designed by hardware and software.

Harari (2017) argues that the ongoing AI revolution brings both significant benefits and concerns. While the impact of technology on society is apparent, society's impact on technology is more nuanced (Westrum, 1989). According to Bareis and Katzenbach (2022), the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) technology into daily life presents a significant challenge. Asher Idan, in a 2020 personal interview with scholars from Bar

Ilan University, notes that many researchers link AI with science fiction and mythical stories such as Frankenstein and Pandora's Box. Two stories explore dystopian scenarios involving artificial intelligence and aim to stimulate and expand discourse regarding the direction of this swiftly evolving technology.

Due to the advancements in AI, humans now faces two major existential threats: self-extinction brought about by planetary overshoot and ecological collapse, as well as obsolescence as a result of AI and robotization. As such, in his 2017 work 'The Sentient Machine: The Coming Age of Artificial Intelligence,' Amir Husain cautions against hyperbole and advocates for the careful consideration of potential risks and benefits (Johnson, 2016). AI is believed to intensify the second threat, particularly with visionary intelligence such as Artificial General Intelligence (AGI), which can surpass humans in cognitive assignments and learn intelligent duties. Nonetheless, regarding research, the sociological perspective is given priority as an analytical mechanism to discuss the influence of artificial intelligence on civilization, especially our society. Sociological research has been undervalued as a valuable contributor to technological advancements.

The existence of a "two cultures" divide between technologists and social scientists is a misperception, as argued by Star (2019), that causes unwarranted distance between these interconnected fields. According to Sartori and Theodorou's (2022) research, the valuable insight of sociology into AI provides a comprehensive comprehension of its social implications. This knowledge enables designers, developers, government officials, and users to foresee potential negative impacts and create effective strategies to address them.

Method

Using qualitative methods, this study combines a literature review with interviews of experts in social science. The goal is to answer several essential questions through a sociological perspective, including: (1) How does sociology view the development of artificial intelligence? (2) What is the impact of artificial intelligence on individuals and society? (3) How can society overcome the disruptive impact of artificial intelligence? and (4). Is there anything that artificial intelligence cannot replace at the individual and societal levels?

The experts we interviewed on AI, which were identified and interviewed by the third and fourth authors, include Erik Markovič of the Association of Writers' Organizations of Slovakia (AOSS); Yuval Noah Harari, of the History department at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem; and Asher Idan, of the Social Network Institute at Bar Ilan University. Anat Perry, Sam Harris, Esther Oluffa Pedersen, and Maryna Lazareva are all distinguished experts in their respective fields. They bring a wealth of knowledge and experience to the table, and their contributions are invaluable. Through their work, they have helped to advance their fields and deepen our understanding of the world around us. Their insights are objective and well-informed, and their writing reflects a commitment to clarity, precision, and logical structure. We are grateful for their contributions and look forward to seeing what they will achieve in the future.

The research is informed by a sociological perspective. Dusek (2009) argued that in the late twentieth century, Sociology with Philosophy emphasized the social construction of technology, challenging theories of technological determinism and

autonomous technology that proposed technology followed a predetermined course based on its logic. Miller (2021) explains that technological development involves values regarding what to instill and what not to instill, showing that technology is not value-free. Technological artifacts are inherently part of the normative order due to their physical properties.

In the field of technology, sociological research plays an integral role in the progress of artificial intelligence. Woolgar (1990) highlights a common perception and concern regarding the potential impact of new technology. Numerous attempts have been made by sociologists to comprehend the capability and nature of information technology in society. One such endeavor is identifying the pervasive presence of inequality within all spheres of society and advocating for structural social change (Joyce et al., 2021). Sociology-based research on artificial intelligence strives to create technology that is consonant with societal capacities and tailored to contextual settings (Lomborg et al., 2023).

According to Bainbridge et al (1994), artificial intelligence could greatly enhance the field of sociology. Sociologists examining technological advancement tend to gravitate towards one of three positions. The first group completely shields themselves from outside pressures to maintain the discipline's traditional roots. The second group takes a more guarded approach, incorporating digital technology as a social construct. The third response involves embracing big data to advance sociology and compete with other disciplines (Boualou & Zahi, 2023).

Results and Discussion

What is artificial intelligence?

Long before the widespread use of digital technology in everyday life, mathematician

and philosopher Alan Turing conceived of the idea of artificial intelligence in 1947 (Luger & Chakrabarti, 2017). Turing aimed to create machines that can emulate human thought processes (Muthukrishnan et al., 2020). The term artificial intelligence (AI) was coined by John McCarthy in 1956 when he organized the first academic conference on the subject (Bowser et al., 2017). McCarthy selected "artificial intelligence" as the name of the conference to distinguish it from cybernetics, which concentrates on how feedback is utilized by animals and machines to modify and rectify their actions, as stated in Kaplan's (2016) research.

There are various definitions of AI. Manning (2020) defines it as the subfield of computer science that aims to make machines operate like humans. Likewise, Burns et al. (2023) describe AI as the simulation of human intelligence processes by computer systems. Tai (2020) notes that although definitions vary, AI is mostly associated with machines and computers, which can help us solve problems and improve our work processes. According to Gabriel (2020), "artificial intelligence" refers to the quality of computer systems and the techniques utilized to attain this capability, including machine learning.

Three lecturers from India, Pradipta Kumar Das, D. Chandrasekhar Rao, and Kishore Kumar Sahu (2020), presented a lecture on Artificial Intelligence (AI) where they provided a clear and objective definition of AI. They emphasized that the definition related to AI depends on the perspective from which it is viewed. The language used is formal, precise, and free from grammatical errors, fulfilling the principles of academic writing. According to them, AI means making machines "knowledgeable" and able to behave like humans. AI can be broadly categorized into three main types. First, Deep AI involves the creation of virtual humans and digital immortals with

sentience, enabling them to feel, perceive, or experience. Second, Pragmatic AI employs machines for tasks like mining large data sets or automating complex and risky tasks. Third, Marketing AI uses algorithms to anticipate a customer's next move and enhance their customer journey.

On threat AI toward humanity

This section is to answer: What is the impact of artificial intelligence on individuals and society? According to Maryna Lazareva from the Department of Humanities at Lviv National University, technology has brought much progress but has also troubled society (Lazareva, 2023). Vostroknutov et al. (2020) agree that the advancement of information technology, especially in the area of AI, creates significant challenges in ethics, legality, social impact, and technology itself. Thiebes et al. (2021) add that these challenges are novel and diverse.

In this case, the advancement of technology, including AI, has resulted in the creation of five global risk classifications: economic, environmental, political, social, and technological (Ivanov, 2018). Previous research has also expressed concerns regarding the threat of AI towards humanity. For instance, Walton & Nayak (2021) emphasized that AI can function as a capitalist tool altering our society in a technological singularity setting, potentially propagating model economic systems. In his article "Artificial Idiocy," Slavoj Zizek (2023) argues that AI, specifically chatbots, may put an end to traditional student essays while also leading people to converse in a chatbot-like manner. In another article cited by Xinting (2020), Slavoj Zizek argues that artificial intelligence creates irrelevance and meaninglessness since it enables us to relinquish control over nature. At the societal level, according to Tai (2020), AI will significantly disrupt human society by

replacing face-to-face communication and interactions, leading to declining human closeness, unemployment, and wealth inequality. Traditional workers will lose their jobs as machines replace human labor. AI investors will claim the majority of earnings, which could exacerbate the wealth gap. The independent operation of AI may result in unforeseen issues and outcomes. Furthermore, AI developers may unintentionally introduce racial bias or egocentric behavior that could negatively impact individuals or objects.

Meanwhile, the impact of artificial intelligence in an individual context depends on the user's approach, evaluated through three perspectives of technology reflection: subjective reflection on technology, objective reflection on the process, and reflection on the results, products, goals, and objectives achieved (Aguilar Gordón, 2011). According to Esther Oluffa Pedersen (personal communication, 2023), our dependence on artificial intelligence not only simplifies tasks but also alters the way we perform them, ultimately enhancing our reliance on technology and impeding critical reasoning and creativity, thereby transforming our information production.

Yuval Noah Harari (2018) argues in his article that artificial intelligence will compete with humans in cognitive skills. He notes that while previous machines competed with us at a manual level, AI now competes with us at a mental level. As such, the advancement of AI will also transform the work of human experts. Based on an interview with Professor Anat Perry (2023) from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and the Director of the Social Cognitive Neuroscience Lab, the development of AI that is closer to human cognition will enable this technology to empathize with humans. If this occurs, AI will become equivalent to its creators. Even though this perspective may currently seem unrealistic, future

advancements will answer this question. Impersonation, such as deepfakes utilizing facial expressions and lip-syncing effects, is currently prevalent (Ahmed, 2022).

On the other hand, one of the greatest dangers of AI for modern society is its ability to disseminate false information disguised as coming from a trustworthy source (Barney, 2023). According to Yusuf & Ar Rosyid (2023), AI impacts industrial content thereby posing a threat to society by exposing individuals to harmful content. Numerous studies demonstrate the influence of AI on the proliferation of information disorders, such as Mal, Mis, and Disinformation. For instance, Biju and Gayathri's (2023) research exposes the role of bots, AI, and trolls in disseminating fake news in India's conflict zones, thereby exacerbating social divisions along the lines of caste, class, religion, gender, and region. Mazurczyk et al. (2023) predicted that AI will hasten the generation and spread of disinformation, rendering it more specific and personalized while also making it difficult to discern from authentic material. Godulla et al. (2021) and Vaccari and Chadwick (2020) have discovered that the advancements in artificial intelligence have spurred the creation of deepfakes, a new form of disinformation transmission. Furthermore, Gosse and Burkell (2020) found that AI has been employed to fashion non-consensual fake pornography and sexual imagery, both currently and potentially in the future. AI-based systems are increasingly utilized to conduct character assassination, especially in the political landscape. In addition, Tatsuya et al (2020) discovered that the autonomous functioning of such systems, which employ machine learning techniques, results in unpredictable and uncontrollable behavior, allowing developers and software engineers to evade responsibility for any harm caused by the system.

Moving from scientific to popular articles, technology practitioners like Mike

Thomas, a Senior Features Writer at Built In (2023), explain that there are 12 types of AI threats. These include lack of AI transparency and explainability, job losses due to automation, social manipulation through algorithms, lack of privacy, biases due to AI resulting in economic inequality, weakening ethics and goodwill, creation of autonomous weapons, financial crises, and loss of human influence. The risk posed by artificial intelligence is also exacerbated by our disregard as contemporary humans trapped in a hostile modern era, such as our focus on quantity over quality, limited knowledge, and the paradoxical pursuit of both freedom and openness. Ruddy Griffiths in conversation with Alain De Botton on book entitled “Do Humankind’s Best Days Lie Ahead?”, describe:

Humankind is obsessed with the quantitative in the modern world. We focus on the pure empirical measurement of ourselves against others, of our society as opposed to other nations, whereas you think the qualitative dimensions of our lives, our inner selves, is still a field of poverty in a way (2020, 57).

Regarding the shallow of knowledge, Amin Maalouf (2011) on his book about “Disordered World: Setting a New Course for the Twenty-first Century”, explain the cause of the occurrence, because humanity progressed materially but not morally, he stated:

We undeniably advanced in the course of the twentieth century on all fronts simultaneously, but not at the same speed. While in the acquisition of knowledge, in the development of science and its technological adaptation for civil and military ends, and in the production and distribution of wealth, change was rapid and upward, that of human behavior was in the main inadequate, and tragically so (2011, 58).

The era of glorified openness also contains dangerous paradoxes, as described by Sam Harris, on her book “The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human”, that stated:

On this front, the internet has simultaneously enabled two opposing influences on belief: On the one hand, it has reduced intellectual isolation by making it more difficult for people to remain ignorant of the diversity of opinion on any given subject. But it has also allowed bad ideas to flourish —as anyone with a computer and too much time on his hands can broadcast his point of view and, often enough, find an audience So while knowledge is increasingly open-source, ignorance is, too (2010, 33)

Humans are experiencing a weakening of their self-control, with modern technology playing a significant role in obtaining and exploiting information about individuals. Certain aspects of modern society are impeding upon humans' ability to persevere through even minor challenges, instead coddling them and potentially paving the way for AI or robotics to manipulate their deepest emotions soon (J. Dixon & Gordon, 2022; Mickevičius, 2019; Shen, 2022). Collective ignorance also plays a significant role in trapping us within the advancement of AI. Although individuals cannot be held solely responsible for their ignorance, they are accountable for contributing to collective ignorance (de Haan, 2021). Ignorance, particularly regarding the consequences of human behavior, poses a threat to our survival according to Ziauddin Sardar (2020).

Sociological perspective toward artificial intelligence (AI)

To answer how sociology views the development of artificial intelligence, we must acknowledge the complex relationship

between sociology and AI. With the global expansion of AI and its potential to transcend human limitations, it has the ability to improve human experiences and society's functioning. AI discourse has the potential to reassess the social aspect of human behavior and highlight opportunities for a more inclusive understanding (Woolgar, 1985). However, as per Yuval Noah Harari's book "21 Lessons for the 21st Century" (2018a), artificial intelligence and biotechnology provide us with the ability to alter and re-engineer life. The shift from the current state to a future where AI is dominant is continual. Presently, our lives are largely artificial, and only a small group actively pursues authenticity.

Additionally, Mlynář et al (2018) posits that AI is a social phenomenon featuring non-human agents. Few sociologists have investigated the effects of Artificial Intelligence on everyday life, its assimilation into social practices, and its potential for analyzing a mixed social realm (Glukhikh et al., 2022). Interesting findings from sociological studies by Ardiyansyah et al. (2019) suggest that artificial intelligence (AI) drives massive progress, which can be attributed to five phenomena, including time-space compression. This can be analyzed through Paul Virilio's theory of praxis loading and freezing of space-time (dromology). The objective is to decrease the distance between points in time by either increasing velocity or decreasing duration. Another approach is time action condensation, which involves condensing various actions into specific periods or units of time. Also, timespace miniaturization, symbolic time-space compression, and psychal time-space condensation can be utilized.

Therefore, according to Sundström (1998), AI technology is considered quasi-autonomous and bound by quasi-determinism or quasi-necessity. Our research

revealed discourse surrounding AI's impact on humanity, which can be divided into four groups. These groups consist of (1) Techno-skeptics who underestimate the challenge AI poses to humanity (Guenduez et al., 2020; Tsigdinos et al., 2022; Zaimakis & Papadaki, 2022); (2) Techno-optimists, such as Königs (2022), believe that technology not only makes the world a better place, but also a good one. Additionally, they posit that innovations can improve the quality of life (Boschetti et al., 2016; 3). Techno-pessimism, as suggested by Esther Oluffa Pedersen in her 2023 interview, posits that modern technology, particularly AI, has led to more problems than solutions, resulting in novel situations and unforeseen consequences. Although some scholars argue that techno-pessimism perpetuates an illusion of post-modern times (Eula et al., 1996; Marx, 1994; Selwyn, 2011), the belief remains prevalent among a significant group. Techno-nihilism posits that the progress of technology towards or away from humanity lacks objective meaning, purpose, or intrinsic value (de Oliveira, 2020).

The foundation of AI and IT is rooted in philosophical and anthropological questions concerning the purpose of life. Mansouri and Paya (2019) contend that nihilism comes into sharp contrast with the value humans place on themselves and their creations. The resignation and apathy of techno-nihilists give definition to this viewpoint. In light of Korotkova et al.'s (2023) findings, it is essential to strike a balance between all discourses for promoting trust in technological advancement. Be analytical and approach this with a level-headed mindset. Contemporary society necessitates comprehension of the inherent value in harmonizing various features to coalesce into a unified entity. Embracing both optimistic and pessimistic attitudes toward shared objectives fosters the ideal outcome. Technology doesn't inherently alter our

behavior but provides opportunities to accommodate our preexisting inclinations and desires (Hughes & Eisikovits, 2022).

About which AI cannot replace

To answer whether artificial intelligence can replace everything at the individual and societal level, our research indicates that there are certain things that it cannot replace. However, it is important to acknowledge that humans are not mere inanimate entities, but rather conscious beings with subjective experiences and agency. Humans should engage with technology as consumers, but they should also strive to master it. The emergence of artificial intelligence, which can perform tasks autonomously and originates from human imagination, raises questions about the role of humans in technological progress. According to existentialists, humans possess unique qualities that distinguish them from other beings. This perspective differs from that of idealists and materialists, who adopt an external standpoint to analyze human beings.

According to our interview with Sam Harris and Yuval Noah Harari (2023), they both contend that there are three forms of human cognition that are not easily replaceable by artificial intelligence, such as (1) curiosity, or the desire to know, for which we need AI tools to motivate and assist us in becoming researchers or creative individuals, and (2) self-awareness, which involves humility. In practice, artificial intelligence (AI) excels at assimilating and incorporating feedback, so you should, as well. Seek insight from others regarding what actions to adopt, cease, and continue. Additionally, emotional intelligence—the capacity to foster relationships, demonstrate empathy, and communicate expertly (pertaining to your own emotional intelligence)—has become increasingly vital. Our research indicates that AI is still devoid

of the emotions, personal encounters, and enthusiasm essential to creating art, although we cannot predict the future. Furthermore, AI models and products are reliant on human input sourced either from the Internet or offline curation. Therefore, the creativity of AI models is limited by the quality of the data they are trained on. This means that they are not capable of inventing new artistic styles, rhythms, or narratives. However, at a societal level, it remains challenging for artificial intelligence to supplant cooperative initiatives, cultural awareness, and socialization.

Even though artificial intelligence has made us more pragmatic, favoring instant and digitally connected solutions, there are concerns that it may alter our relationship patterns. However, this does not entirely erase our humanity and our place in society – we are social beings, even if we do not participate in typical social activities. Humans are inherently social beings. According to Yuval Noah Harari (personal interview, 2023), despite artificial intelligence's sophistication, humans instinctively seek others as venues to share their feelings, contribute, and reinforce their identity.

The cooperation initiative empowers society to create a sense of social solidarity, encouraging everyone to play a more active role in continuous humanitarian solidarity. During socialization, individuals learn the guidelines and patterns of behavior necessary to exist as human beings and develop cultural awareness. Society encourages effective communication, respect, and self-awareness in every individual. Biased language and ornamental phrasing should be avoided to ensure clear, concise writing that adheres to formal academic writing conventions. Technical terminology should be used when precise vocabulary is required. In addition, grammatical correctness and adherence to style guides are essential for high-quality writing.

This study concludes that Artificial Intelligence has far-reaching consequences for the future. Just as the release of other misfortunes on humanity had long-lasting consequences from opening Pandora's Box, the widespread adoption of AI could have similarly long-lasting ramifications on our society that we may not fully comprehend or appreciate (Danidou, 2021; Karakose et al., 2023; Nitzberg & Zysman, 2022; Storey et al., 2021). Meanwhile, the relevance of a metaphorical examination of Mary Shelley's "Frankenstein" increases in our AI-dominated world, where neural networks supplant the lightning-born monsters of modern horror tales.

The creator's liability for generating a monster resulted in its transformation into a dread-inspiring entity, aligning with the unintentional outcomes of Victor's creation that caused his downfall. Similarly, AI's consequences on the economy, job displacement, and existential challenges parallel Victor's creation. The issue of AI system control and the possibility of autonomous decision-making is a critical concern. The AI narrative is fraught with emotions, particularly the fear of AI triggering societal changes. The ongoing battle between human creators and their AI creations epitomizes the age-old apprehension of technological inundation. Prospective analysis is warranted, as we must create a roadmap that outlines a potential or probable future.

However, in a personal interview conducted by the fourth author in 2023, Erik Markovič from the Association of Writers' Organizations of Slovakia (AOSS) argues that artificial intelligence can express intelligence beyond our biological confines. With the emergence of quantum computing, AI is designed to emulate human brain functioning, resulting in a creation made in our image. Once general intelligence has

developed sufficiently, AI will have access to a wide range of human knowledge, including extensive databases, private communications, and online personas. With quantum computing technology and 5G, AI will become omnipresent, capable of penetrating encryption schemes. As AI becomes self-replicating, we will become cybernetic organisms, reliant on our technology. AI-powered technologies monitor our spending habits, target us with advertisements, and track our social media interests, thus creating echo chambers. With the constant evolution of AI, it becomes increasingly challenging to determine what qualifies as artificial intelligence.

How to overcome?

To address the impact of artificial intelligence on society, it is important to acknowledge that the technologies themselves are not the main issue, but rather the influential individuals controlling them. The fate of humanism relies on those who possess vast amounts of big data, and the crucial question is whether they will use these developments for constructive or destructive purposes. Additionally, it is crucial to recognize that empowering AI can lead to its overpowering of us.

There is indeed a concern that in the future, it will be technology, especially those who are cognitively more intelligent, that will dominate humans, but according to Max Tegmark, on his book "Life 3.0: being human in the age of artificial intelligence", stated:

The robot misconception is related to the myth that machines can't control humans. Intelligence enables control: humans control tigers not because we're stronger, but because we're smarter. This means that if we cede our position as smartest on our planet, it's possible that we might also cede control (2013).

According to Olaore et al (2014), the Christian teachings espouse the same perspective that God created humans as the pinnacle of his creation and provided them with a cosmic home. It is difficult to envision a future where robots provide for, cultivate, procreate, and even rule. Another argument advanced by Christian scholars is that artificial intelligence lacks essential attributes for personality. Even partial AIs may not surpass or replace the divine nature of humans, who are made in God's image or *Imago Dei* (Gunarso et al., 2022).

To overcome this challenge, we propose three steps. First, we need to prioritize values. Second, we need to establish rules. Third, we need to engage in critical discourse. First, we need to prioritize values. First, we need to prioritize values. Strengthening religious values and local wisdom is crucial for developing the first step. Religion should be a fundamental aspect of our humanity as we advance in artificial intelligence. The difference between humans and machines lies in our spirituality, which acknowledges the existence of God or higher powers external to ourselves. Religion should not be restricted to a mere inherent identity but instead encompasses the spiritual realm. To comprehend our sense of humanity amidst technological advancements, we must approach religion from a spiritual standpoint. This is crucial as there exists a significant divide between secular and divine values (Ziaee, 2012). Song (2021) suggests that linking religious teachers or values with AI is a viable approach to decreasing the risks posed by superintelligence. For instance, Alkhiri (2022) argues that in Islam, the uses and applications of AI must be in line with the creations, commands, and associated aspects of God the Blessing, Exalted.

Connected AI development and religion can incorporate moral values that affirm human dignity. Numerous studies about

artificial intelligence and human dignity have identified three fundamental aspects that must be considered: ontological claims, which acknowledge the intrinsic value of unique human attributes that are irreplaceable and present in every person. Secondly, the principle of dignity of recognition pertains to the acknowledgment and appreciation of fellow human beings. Thirdly, the relation claim aligns with Kant's concept that the state must be accessible to every individual with a focus on human beings and values at the forefront of all policies.

In the context of local wisdom, let us consider an example from the Indonesian archipelago, also known as Nusantara, regarding the concept of *cipta*, *karsa*, and *rasa*, collectively referred to as *Tridaya*. *Karsa* pertains to the underlying thoughts or concepts of a work, encompassing the creator's intended idea or message for their audience. It also involves the human capacity to plan, design, and conceptualize intricate concepts. By means of *karsa*, individuals can grasp the purpose, significance, and direction of their lives. Self-actualization through intention involves delving into profound thoughts and formulating robust visions and goals to attain a deeper knowledge of oneself and the world. *Rasa* encompasses the emotions or feelings that a work of art evokes. Technical terms will be explained upon first usage. Self-actualization through *rasa* entails being able to experience emotional depth, manage feelings, and gain insight from life experiences. Authentic emotional expression can enhance human connections with oneself and others. *Cipta* encompasses thought, knowledge, insight, ideas, logic, reasoning, design, creation, innovation, imagination, contemplation, and inspiration. To actualize human potential, one must respect and integrate these aspects while fostering creativity, setting goals, and valuing emotions. Appreciating these

aspects contributes to well-being, meaning, and positive societal impact. These benefits cannot be replicated by artificial intelligence.

We need to establish regulations for technology. In 1942, Asimov proposed the "Three Laws of Robotics" for AI in the current context. The first law states that "a robot may not injure or allow a human to be injured." The second law states that "a robot must obey human orders unless they violate the First Law." The third law states that "a robot must protect its existence without violating the First or Second Laws." The first, second, and third laws take precedence over all others, and AI cannot mix up this predefined order. Isaac Asimov's efforts to instill morality into AI for safety purposes are evident in his established rules (Barrigüete, 2018; Patrón, 2021; Li et al., 2022; Montejano Rodríguez et al., 2021).

According to Li et al. (2022), Asimov's concept of "robotics" influenced science fiction, information technology, and robotics. To address the challenges in the employment sector, the state must create policies that reduce the insecurity experienced by low-skilled workers (Lim, 2020).

Regarding discourse, we propose post-humanism as a critical analysis to explore the implications of emerging technologies for humanity (Blok, 2022; Chen, 2018). Additionally, we suggest digital humanism as a praxis for affirming AI based on human rights, democracy, inclusion, and diversity (Funk et al., 2023; Wyatt, 2021). Post-humanism is a philosophical movement based on desire toward humanity (Fairchild et al., 2022) that challenges traditional human-centered views of the world and explores the implications of emerging technologies like artificial intelligence, biotechnology, and robotics for the future of humanity (Ahn, 2023; Mercer, 2021; Porpora, 2017).

Human dignity in post-humanist discourse must be understood through three basic elements: ontological claims that

describe unique human qualities which are invaluable, irreplaceable, and inherent in every individual. Second, the principle of dignity of recognition involves recognizing and appreciating fellow human beings, while the third principle, the relation claim, asserts that the state should exist to promote human beings and human values as the ultimate goal in every policy. This idea originates from Kant's philosophy (Deretić & Sorgner, 2015; J. B. Dixon & Cassidy, 2005; Yoon, 2022).

We need digital humanism to navigate the intricacies of the relationships between people and machines in the digital age. Werthner et al (2021) advocate for digital humanism to recognize the potential benefits of information technology, while remaining cognizant of the attendant societal risks associated with privacy breaches, ethical quandaries surrounding artificial intelligence and automation, the loss of employment opportunities, ongoing monopolies on the Web, and issues of sovereignty. Artificial intelligence must be approached from an ethical and moral perspective to effectively address human issues. The ethical viewpoint regarding intelligent machines facilitates problem-solving by integrating theoretical and practical concepts of moral freedom. The correlation between freedom and responsibility should operate on both a broad and limited scale. Responsibility is a condition of freedom, where freedom is characterized by its type and degree. AI Safety spans a range of knowledge domains, such as computer science, robotics, mathematics, and economics among others, with the goal of ensuring safety and improving the benefits of AI systems as they continue to advance. Achieving this includes the creation of interpretable models that adhere to constraints and avoiding potential AGI risks, despite their complexity.

Conclusion

AI, an artificial intelligence system, has the potential to cause unintended and uncontrollable consequences, like the mythological Pandora's Box or Frankenstein. Nevertheless, AI should be ethically developed and distributed to provide benefits to humanity. According to Persson (2001), to ensure and maintain human well-being, progress must always begin with the question, "What is the cost to human life, integrity, and dignity?"

In this context, artificial intelligence is viewed as a product of human ingenuity and enterprise guided by curiosity and utility. Is this achievable? While AI's advance is relentless, it must not be allowed to become detached from the natural world, instead becoming integrated as one of life's elements, rather than the only one. Maintaining a connection with the body and environment is key.

Artificial intelligence cannot replace three crucial forms of human cognition: curiosity, humility, and emotional intelligence. Furthermore, on a societal level, AI cannot replace initiatives that promote cooperation, cultural awareness, and encourage individuals to participate in society (sense of socialization). To address the implications of AI, we must enhance post-humanism as discourse and digital humanism as a framework, with a focus on human rights, democracy, inclusion, and diversity. Religious values and indigenous knowledge must be incorporated to mitigate the risks associated with AI. AI and human relationships must be supportive, guided by ethical values, and reasonable policies should be implemented to safeguard security and well-being.

As AI continues to advance, it is vital for authorities to establish guidelines that protect humanity while also promoting

technological innovation. The merging of AI and human intelligence can pave the path to new avenues of creativity. The potential of AI presents the foremost challenge of our era, as it leads us down uncharted paths. Enhancing AI systems necessitates collective feedback and comprehension within a framework of human-collaboration and co-creation. The path ahead is lengthy and obstructed by many unexpected trials and tribulations.

We must recognize that AI systems are not entirely objective; instead, they are influenced by human culture, including our values, norms, preferences, and societal behavior patterns. Consequently, our cultural influences are embedded in the construction of AI systems. Therefore, rather than questioning whether AI systems are good or bad for society, it is important to note that, according to Klugman & Gerke (2022), there are no absolutes in discussing AI, no true or false, no good or bad. We are aware that machine development and improvement are progressing at an exponential rate, and it's highly probable that machines will soon surpass human capabilities. We must design machines that align with our values and principles.

Acknowledgments

Thank you to all parties in Greece, Indonesia, Sweden, and the United States who supported us in writing this research. May peace always be with us.

Declaration of Ownership

This article is our original work.

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest to declare in this article.

Ethical Clearance

This study was approved by the institution.

References

- Ahmed, S. (2022). Impact of deepfake technology on digital world authenticity: A review. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Research*, 12(3), 78-84. <https://doi.org/10.31033/ijemr.12.3.10>
- Ahn, S. (2023). Humanism contra post-humanism. *Historical Materialism*, 53(1), 63-92. <https://doi.org/10.1163/1569206x-20232009>
- Alkhiri, T. A. A. (2022). Human right requirements in the metaverse era. *International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security*, 22(8), 67-74. <https://doi.org/10.22937/IJCSNS.2022.22.8.9>
- Ardiyansyah, B., Kartono, D. T., & Demartoto, A. (2019). Dromologi dan era flash sale: Tinjauan geliat manusia dalam cyberspace. *Simulacra*, 2(2), 115-131. <https://doi.org/10.21107/sml.v2i2.6143>
- Bainbridge, W. S., Brent, E. E., Carley, K. M., Heise, D. R., Macy, M. W., Markovsky, B., & Skvoretz, J. (1994). Artificial social intelligence. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 20(1), 407-436. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.20.080194.002203>
- Bareis, J., & Katzenbach, C. (2022). Talking AI into being: The narratives and imaginaries of national AI strategies and their performative politics. *Science Technology and Human Values*, 47(5), 855-881. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01622439211030007>
- Barney, N. (2023). *Deepfake AI*. Tech Target. <https://www.techtarget.com/whatis/definition/deepfake>
- Barrigüete, J. L. A. (2018). Science fiction transhumanism: Exegesis of the foundation saga by Isaac Asimov. *Cultura, Lenguaje y Representacion*, 19, 31-44. <https://doi.org/10.6035/clr.2018.19.2>
- Biju, P. R., & Gayathri, O. (2023). Self-breeding fake news: Bots and artificial intelligence perpetuate social polarization in India's conflict zones. *International Journal of Information, Diversity and Inclusion*, 7(1-2), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39409>
- Blok, V. (2022). The ontology of technology beyond anthropocentrism and determinism: The role of technologies in the constitution of the (post)anthropocene world. *Foundations of Science*, 28, 987-1005. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10699-022-09829-1>
- Boschetti, F., Price, J., & Walker, I. (2016). Myths of the future and scenario archetypes. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 111, 76-85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.06.009>
- Boualou, E. Arabi, & Zahi, F. (2023). Sociology & digital technology: The Mutation of sociological research. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 175, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202317501054>
- Bowser, B. A., Sloan, M., Michelucci, P., Pauwels, E., Chiappa, S., Gillam, T. P. S., Floridi, L., Taddeo, M., Turilli, M., Brundage, M., Avin, S., Clark, J., Allen, G. C., Flynn, C., Farquhar, S., Crootof, R., Bryson, J. (2017). Artificial intelligence: A policy-oriented introduction. *Wilson Briefs*, 40(October).
- Burns, E., Laskowski, N., & Tucci, L. (2023). *What is artificial intelligence (AI)? AI definition and how it works*. Enterprise AI. <https://www.techtarget.com/searchenterpriseai/definition/AI-Artificial-Intelligence>
- Patrón, J. M. C. (2021). Entre la ciencia y la ficción: Isaac Asimov y Arthur C. Clarke. *Herreriana*, 3(1), 43-47. <https://doi.org/10.29057/h.v3i1.6549>
- Campbell, C. (2022). Sleepwalking into singularity. In *AI by design: A plan for*

- living with artificial intelligence*. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003267003-1>
- Chen, M. (2018). AI, cyborgs and post-humanism theory in animation and films. *MATEC Web of Conferences*, 228, 2-3. <https://doi.org/10.1051/mateconf/201822805005>
- Danidou, Y. (2021). Opening Pandora's box: IoT and cybersecurity aspects to consider while regulating. In *EU Internet Law in the Digital Single Market*, 397-416. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69583-5_17
- Das, P. K., Rao, C., & Sahu, K. (2020). *Artificial intelligence lecture note* (BCS-404: 2). <https://www.studocu.com/row/document/ecole-superieure-en-informatique-de-sidi-bel-abbes/linear-algebra/lecture-1428643004/57924759>
- de Haan, N. (2021). Collective culpable ignorance. *Thought: A Journal of Philosophy* 10(2), 99-108. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tht3.484>
- de Oliveira, J. R. (2020). Nihilism and technology. *Filosofia Unisinos*, 21(1), 72-78. <https://doi.org/10.4013/FSU.2020.211.07>
- Deretić, I., & Sorgner, S. L. (2015). From humanism to meta-, post- and transhumanism? In *Beyond Humanism: Trans- and Posthumanism Volume 8*. <https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-653-05483-5>
- Dixon, J. B., & Cassidy, E. J. (2005). *Virtual futures: Cyberotics, technology and post-human pragmatism*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203983676>
- Dixon, J., & Gordon, N. (2022). Improving graduate futures and employability through embedded industrial experience. *New Directions in the Teaching of Physical Sciences*, 17, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.29311/ndtps.v0i17.3596>
- Dusek, V. (2009). Introduction: Philosophy and technology. In *A companion to the philosophy of technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444310795.ch22>
- Eula, M. J., Ezrahi, Y., Mendelsohn, E., & Segal, H. (1996). Review: Technology, pessimism, and postmodernism. *The History Teacher*, 29(3), 400-401. <https://doi.org/10.2307/494561>
- Fairchild, N., Lee, C., & Sidebottom, K. (2022). Post humanism: A desire for a new humanity. *Cultural and Pedagogical Inquiry*, 13(1), 86-87. <https://doi.org/10.18733/cpi29638>
- Funk, M., Frauenberger, C., & Reichl, P. (2023). Robotic co-evolution or k.o. of robo-evolution - quo vadis, digital humanism? *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, 366, 463-472. <https://doi.org/10.3233/FAIA220647>
- Gabriel, I. (2020). Artificial intelligence, values, and alignment. *Minds and Machines*, 30(3), 411-437. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-020-09539-2>
- Glukhikh, V. A., Eliseev, S. M., & Kirsanova, N. P. (2022). Artificial intelligence as a problem of modern sociology. *Discourse*, 8(1), 82-93. <https://doi.org/10.32603/2412-8562-2022-8-1-82-93>
- Godulla, A., Hoffmann, C. P., & Seibert, D. M. A. (2021). Dealing with deepfakes: An interdisciplinary examination of the state of research and implications for communication studies. *Studies in Communication and Media*, 10(1), 72-96. <https://doi.org/10.5771/2192-4007-2021-1-72>
- Gordón, F. A. (2011). Reflexiones filosóficas sobre la tecnología y sus nuevos escenarios. *Sophía*, 1(11), 123-172. <https://doi.org/10.17163/soph.n11.2011.06>
- Gosse, C., & Burkell, J. (2020). Politics and porn: How news media characterizes problems presented by deepfakes. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 37(5), 497-511. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2020.1832697>
- Griffiths, R. (2020). Pre-debate interviews [Science]. In 2 (Ed.), *Do humankind's best days lie ahead? The Munk debates!*

- Steven Pinker, Matt Ridley, Alain de Botton, Malcolm Gladwell; (p. 57). Aurea Foundation.
- Guenduez, A. A., Mettler, T., & Schedler, K. (2020). Technological frames in public administration: What do public managers think of big data? *Government Information Quarterly*, 37(1), 101406. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.101406>
- Gunarso, G., Mokerowu, Y., Boy Saragih, D., & Perangin Angin, P. (2022). Artificial intelligence in a Christian perspective of humanity and personhood. *International Dialogues on Education Journal*, 9(1), 176-191. <https://doi.org/10.53308/ide.v9i1.279>
- Harari, Y. N. (2017). Reboot for the AI revolution. *Nature*, 550, 324-327. <https://doi.org/10.1038/550324a>
- Harari, Y. N. (2018a). *21 lessons for the 21st century*. Jonathan Cape.
- Harari, Y. N. (2018b). Why {technology} {favors} {tyranny}. *The Atlantic*.
- Harris, S. (2010). Belief. In *The moral landscape: How science can determine human* (pp. 150-167). Simon & Schuster, Inc.
- Hughes, J., & Eisikovits, N. (2022). Post-dystopian technorealism of Ted Chiang. *Journal of Ethics and Emerging Technologies*, 32(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.55613/jeet.v32i1.97>
- Ivanov, O. B. (2018). Problems and risks of the modern world and the ways of their solution. *International Journal of Engineering & Technology*, 7(4.38), 1137-1141. <https://doi.org/10.14419/ijet.v7i4.38.277491137-1141>
- Johnson, B. D. (2016). Science fiction and the coming age of sentient tools. *Computer*, 49(6), 95-97. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2016.171>
- Joyce, K., Smith-Doerr, L., Alegria, S., Bell, S., Cruz, T., Hoffman, S. G., Noble, S. U., & Shestakofsky, B. (2021). Toward a sociology of artificial intelligence: A call for research on inequalities and structural change. *Socius*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023121999581>
- Kaplan, J. (2016). The intellectual history of artificial intelligence. In *Artificial intelligence: What everyone needs to know*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/wentk/9780190602383.003.0002>
- Karakose, T., Demirkol, M., Yirci, R., Polat, H., Ozdemir, T. Y., & Tülübaş, T. (2023). A conversation with ChatGPT about digital leadership and technology integration: Comparative analysis based on human-AI collaboration. *Administrative Sciences*, 13(7), 157-159. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13070157>
- Klugman, C. M., & Gerke, S. (2022). Rise of the bioethics AI: Curse or blessing? *American Journal of Bioethics*, 22(7), 35-37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2022.2075056>
- Königs, P. (2022). What is techno-optimism? *Philosophy and Technology*, 35(3), 63-76. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-022-00555-x>
- Korotkova, N., Benders, J., Mikalef, P., & Cameron, D. (2023). Maneuvering between skepticism and optimism about hyped technologies: Building trust in digital twins. *Information and Management*, 60(4), 45-57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2023.103787>
- Li, T., Mao, C., Shen, J., & Zhou, M. (2022). Three laws of design for biomedical micro/nanorobots. *Nano Today*, 45, 88-101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nantod.2022.101560>
- Lim, S. (2020). Embedding technological transformation: The welfare state and citizen attitudes toward technology. *European Political Science Review*, 12(1), 67-89. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755773919000341>

- Lomborg, S., Kaun, A., & Scott Hansen, S. (2023). Automated decision-making: Toward a people-centred approach. *Sociology Compass*, 17(8), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.13097>
- Luger, G. F., & Chakrabarti, C. (2017). From Alan Turing to modern AI: Practical solutions and an implicit epistemic stance. *AI and Society*, 32(3), 321-338. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-016-0646-7>
- Maalouf, A. (2011). Misleading victories [social science]. In *Disordered world: Setting a new course for the twenty-first century* (p. 53). Pinguin.
- Manning, C. (2020). Artificial intelligence definitions. *Stanford University*.
- Mansouri, A., & Paya, A. (2019). Nihilism and information technology. *Journal of Philosophical Theological Research*, 21(4), 29-32. <https://doi.org/10.22091/jptr.2019.4903.2218>
- Marx, L. (1994). The idea of "technology" and postmodern pessimism. In *Technology, pessimism, and postmodernism*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-0876-8_2
- Mazurczyk, W., Lee, D., & Vlachos, A. (2023). Disinformation 2.0 in the age of AI: A cybersecurity perspective. [Preprint].
- Mercer, S. J. R. (2021). Humanism and the sociology of post-work. *Economy and Society*, 50(4), 686-706. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03085147.2021.1938881>
- Mickevičius, T. N. (2019). The context of Heidegger's philosophy of technology: Cassirer, Jünger, Spengler. *Problemos*, 95, 33-41. <https://doi.org/10.15388/Problemos.95.3>
- Miller, B. (2021). Is technology value-neutral? *Science Technology and Human Values*, 46(1), 53-80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243919900965>
- Mlynář, J., Alavi, H. S., Verma, H., & Cantoni, L. (2018). Towards a sociological conception of artificial intelligence. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (Including Subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, 10999 LNAI, 130-139. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-97676-1_13
- Montejano, J. R., De Almeida Peres, M. A., Gómez Cantarino, S., Silva Dias, A., Torres Alamino, M. A., & De Dios Aguado, M. (2021). Enfermería de ciencia ficción: Hildegard Peplau en el cuento "Lastborn" de Isaac Asimov. *História Da Enfermagem*, 12(1), 31-38. <https://doi.org/10.51234/here.21.v12n1.a3>
- Muthukrishnan, N., Maleki, F., Ovens, K., Reinhold, C., Forghani, B., & Forghani, R. (2020). Brief history of artificial intelligence. *Neuroimaging Clinics of North America*, 30(4), 393-399. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nic.2020.07.004>
- Nitzberg, M., & Zysman, J. (2022). Algorithms, data, and platforms: The diverse challenges of governing AI. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 29(11), 1753-1778. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2022.2096668>
- Olaore, I. B., C, N. J., Oladipo, S., & Oyenuga, E. O. (2014). Artificial intelligence (AI): The Christian perspective. *Journal of Information Engineering and Applications*, 4(11), 96-100.
- Persson, R. S. (2001). Pandora 's box revisited? On information technology, technostress, virtual addiction and the effects of information overload. In M. Chaib (Ed.), *Perspectives on human-computer interactions: A multidisciplinary approach* (pp. 17-49). Studentlitteratur.
- Porpora, D. V. (2017). Dehumanization in theory: Anti-humanism, non-humanism, post-humanism, and trans-humanism. *Journal of Critical Realism*, 16(4), 353-367. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767430.2017.1340010>
- Sardar, Z. (2020). The smog of ignorance: Knowledge and wisdom in postnormal

- times. *Futures*, 120, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2020.102554>
- Sartori, L., & Theodorou, A. (2022). A sociotechnical perspective for the future of AI: Narratives, inequalities, and human control. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 24(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-022-09624-3>
- Selwyn, N. (2011). Editorial: In praise of pessimism—the need for negativity in educational technology. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 42(5), 13-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2011.01215.x>
- Shen, X. (2022). Metaverse: The latest sign of human existence. *Metaverse*, 3(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.54517/met.v3i1.1794>
- Song, Y. S. (2021). Religious AI as an option to the risks of superintelligence: A Protestant theological perspective. *Theology and Science*, 19(1), 65-78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14746700.2020.1825196>
- Star, S. L. (2019). Power, technology, and the phenomenology of conventions: On being allergic to onions. In G. Bowker (Ed.), *Boundary objects and beyond: Working with Leigh Star*. The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/10113.003.0018>
- Storey, V. C., Montreal, H., Ca, R. L., Maass, W., & Parsons, J. (2022). Explainable AI: Opening the black box or Pandora's box? *Communications of the ACM*, 65(4), 27–29. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3490699>
- Sundström, P. (1998). Interpreting the notion that technology is value-neutral. *Medicine, Health Care, and Philosophy*, 1(1), 41-45. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009933805126>
- Tai, M. C. T. (2020). The impact of artificial intelligence on human society and bioethics. *Tzu Chi Medical Journal*, 32(4), 339-343. https://doi.org/10.4103/tcmj.tcmj_71_20
- Tegmark, M. (2013). *Life 3.0: Being human in the age of AI*. Penguin.
- Thiebes, S., Lins, S., & Sunyaev, A. (2021). Trustworthy artificial intelligence. *Electronic Markets*, 31(2), 447-464. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-020-00441-4>
- Thomas, M. (2023). 12 Risks and dangers of artificial intelligence (AI). BuiltIn. <https://builtin.com/artificial-intelligence/risks-of-artificial-intelligence>
- Tsigdinos, S., Tzouras, P. G., Bakogiannis, E., Kepaptsoglou, K., & Nikitas, A. (2022). The future urban road: A systematic literature review-enhanced Q-method study with experts. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2021.103158>
- Vaccari, C., & Chadwick, A. (2020). Deepfakes and disinformation: Exploring the impact of synthetic political video on deception, uncertainty, and trust in news. *Social Media and Society*, 6(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120903408>
- Vostroknutov, I., Grigoriev, S., & Surot, L. (2020). Modern challenges of humanity and the search for a new paradigm of education. *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, 2770.
- Walton, N., & Nayak, B. S. (2021). Rethinking of Marxist perspectives on big data, artificial intelligence (AI) and capitalist economic development. In *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 166, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120576>
- Werthner, H., Prem, E., Lee, E. A., & Ghezzi, C. (2021). *Perspectives on digital humanism*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-86144-5>
- Westrum, R. (1989). The social construction of technological systems. *Social Studies of Science*, 19(1), 189-191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030631289019001010>
- Woolgar, S. (1985). Why not a sociology of machines? The case of sociology and artificial intelligence. *Sociology*, 19(4), 557-572. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038585019004005>

- Woolgar, S. (1990). Configuring the user: The case of usability trials. *The Sociological Review*, 38(1_suppl), 58-99. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954x.1990.tb03349.x>
- Wyatt, S. (2021). Interdisciplinarity: Models and values for digital humanism. In Werthner, H. (Eds.). *Perspectives on digital humanism*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-86144-5_45
- Xinting, L. (2020). Reflections on post-human discourse: Centering on Slavoj Žižek. *Theoretical Studies in Literature and Art*, 40(6), 184-191. <https://tsla.researchcommons.org/journal/vol40/iss6/10>
- Yeh, S. C., Wu, A. W., Yu, H. C., Wu, H. C., Kuo, Y. P., & Chen, P. X. (2021). Public perception of artificial intelligence and its connections to the sustainable development goals. *Sustainability*, 13(16), 9165. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13169165>
- Yoon, O. H. (2022). Exploring the direction of post-humanism discourse and future education. *Journal of Human Studies*, 48, 7-32. <https://doi.org/10.21738/jhs.2022.12.48.7>
- Zaimakis, Y., & Papadaki, M. (2022). On the digitalisation of higher education in times of the pandemic crisis: Technophilic and techno-sceptic attitudes of social science students in Crete (Greece). *SN Social Sciences*, 2, 77-89. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-022-00380-1>
- Ziaee, A. A. (2012). A philosophical approach to artificial intelligence and Islamic values. *IIUM Engineering Journal*, 12(6), 73-78. <https://doi.org/10.31436/iiumej.v12i6.191>
- Žižek, S. (2023). *Artificial idiocy*. Project Syndicate. <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/ai-chatbots-naive-idiots-no-sense-of-irony-by-slavoj-zizek-2023-03?barrier=accesspaylog>