International Society
of Philosophy and Cosmology

Future Human Image

Volume 15



Kyiv, 2021

Future Human Image, Volume 15, 2021
The Academic Journal

ISSN 2519-2604 (Online), ISSN 2311-8822 (Print)
The State Registration Certificate of the print media KB No.20662-10462P, April 17, 2014

http://fhijournal.org/
E-mail: mfkoorg@gmail.com
It was printed as a collective monograph "Future Human Image: Whom and How to Educate in the Rising Generations?" since 2011.
Printed Academic Journal "Future Human Image" since Volume 4, 2014.

Printed according to the resolution of the Scientific Board of *International Society of Philosophy and Cosmology* (Minutes of meeting No 12 from April 15, 2021)

Editor-in-Chief

Sergii Rudenko, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)
Denys Svyrydenko, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor (China)

Editorial Board

Anna Afonasina, Ph.D. (Philosophy), Associate Professor (Russia)
Mohamad Awwad, M.Sc., Lecturer, (Canada)
Oleg Bazaluk, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (China)
Galyna Beregova, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)
Enric Cabrejas, M.Sc. (Spain)
Danny Dubé, Ph.D. (Computer Science), Professor (Canada)
Eric G. Frost, Ph.D., Professor (United States)
Tracey Isaacs, Ph.D. (South Africa)
Nataliia Kharchenko, Doctor of Psychological Sciences, Assistant Professor (Ukraine)
Sergey Krichevskiy, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Russia)
Iryna Liashenko, Ph.D. (Philosophy), Associate Professor (Ukraine)
Tetiana Matusevych, Ph.D. (Philosophy), Associate Professor (Ukraine)
Tomasz Mróz, Ph.D., Professor (Poland)
Olga Petriashvili, Doctor Philological Sciences, Professor (Georgia)
Raushan Shindaulova, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor (Kazakhstan)
Sergiy Terepyshchyi, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)
Bogdan Trocha, Dr. Habil. (Liberal Arts, Philology), Professor (Poland)
Nataliya Yukhymenko, Ph.D. (Philosophy), Associate Professor (Ukraine)

The Journal is indexed in the following international databases:
Central and Eastern European Online Library (CEEOL); Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ); Directory of Open Access Repositories (OpenDOAR); EBSCO (Sociology Source Ultimate); ERIH Plus; Index Copernicus; Open Academic Journals Index; Registry of Open Access Repositories (ROAR); Science Index; ResearchBib; The Philosopher's Index; Ulrich's Periodicals Directory; WorldCat

International Society of Philosophy and Cosmology:
http://www.bazaluk.org/

© International Society of Philosophy and Cosmology, 2021

Polysubjectivity and Contextuality of the Ethical in Contemporary Digital Culture

Olena Yatsenko

Ph.D. in Philosophy, Associate Professor, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University
(Kyiv, Ukraine)
E-mail: yatsenkood@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0584-933X

Yatsenko, Olena (2021) Polysubjectivity and Contextuality of the Ethical in Contemporary Digital Culture. *Future Human Image*, Volume 15, 148-158. https://doi.org/10.29202/fhi/15/13

Creating futurological projects and their corresponding analytics causes a wide resonance in public discourse around the world. A globalized society firmly links the content of possible future projects to develop and implement high-order technologies. The argument is substantiated that the creation of various scenarios of humanity's fate is carried out within a particular ideological doctrine framework. The comprehension of potential transformations' causal connections is carried out according to the principles and categories that are already known to world philosophy. At the same time, social reality, significantly modified under the influence of high technologies, produces original ethical and legal contradictions, for the resolution of which either a significant categorical analysis of the connection between humanity and technology or the creation of a fundamentally new paradigm for the analysis of these relationships is required.

Keywords: high tech, robotics, AI systems, humanity, digital culture, values, polysubjectivity, solidarity

Received: 23 December 2020 / Accepted: 26 February 2021 / Published: 25 April 2021

Introduction

The improvement of high technologies (high-tech) is closely related to human self-improvement, and technogenesis significantly affects anthropogenesis. Civilization is developing exponentially, and information technology (IT) is modifying the world's picture and humanity's ideas about the past and the future. In this environment, the most relevant ideas for determining the future are concentrated since a person endowed with free will is doomed to create one's own essence. We can state a certain problematicity and contrast of the combination of traditional anthropological projects with improving technologies. There is an actualization of issues regarding the fate of a person and a nation, ethics, and gender in

© Yatsenko, Olena, 2021

the context of the rapid development of high-tech, formation, and expansion of humanity's concept.

Our time's urgent problems include the rapid development of robotics, developments in artificial intelligence (AI), and, accordingly, the issue of the value of human life, futurology, and predicting humanity's survival on a planetary scale. In all likelihood, our future largely depends on the development of AI and IT, the possible progress or regression of human nature in the field of explication of human activity. A paradox is formed: a person creates new technologies, algorithms, and large databases to resist global problems and possible cataclysms, the development of which, in turn, calls into question the existence of a person as the leading cause of these problems.

The Future of Humanity in the Context of Technological Progress

The problem of humanity's future as a principle of interaction and communication is of great interest to scientists worldwide. A team of 32 scientists (Chairs Constantine Stephanidis et al., 2019) explores the Global Challenges that arise in the context of the rapid technological evolution to intelligent interactive technologies, the development of which is changing the format of societal needs, individual and collective expectations. As the basic principles of such analysis, the authors call the humanistic and social values that govern individual and social life: "There is already a trend that everything must be 'smart,' whether it is a device, software, service, car, environment, or even an entire city. Technological advancements will eventually make it possible to inject some AI into even the most common products, a revolution occurring so gradually that it may have passed unnoticed" (Chairs Constantine Stephanidis, 2019: 1231). In conclusion, the authors name seven Global Challenges facing humanity in the horizon of the present and the future: the symbiosis of human and technology, human interaction with nature, ethics of confidentiality and security, health and happiness of human life, universal access to information, learning opportunities and self-realization, social order, and democracy. For each segment of the study, the authors provide the problem definition and meaning of the phenomenon, the main components of the problem situation, the current state of technology, and new requirements for the principles and rules of human behavior. In the context of human-technology interaction, the authors note the following main potential dangers: the problem of human control over the development and consequences of technological progress, the issue of content and regulation of human rights and responsibilities, the problem of human development (which is a comfortable environment is a significant threat), the problem of introducing human values into decision-making algorithms, the issue of convergence of individual preferences and public interests in the context of increasing the power of influence, environmental and social changes caused by the development of technology.

In the context of such considerations, Alexander Trauth-Goik (2020) analyzes this problem. He argues that the prospects for the future are determined by the discourse of the 4th Industrial Revolution. This discourse's semantic core is the exponential technological changes and convergence of human and technology, which occurs in the physical, digital, and biological spheres. The author is convinced that the main threat in the strategies of building the future is the priority of business interests over the principles of the ontology of interdependence and ethics of care: "The mantle of responsibility for managing the development of new technologies meanwhile finds itself handed to business and industry, those actors who by their capacity to "innovate" are posited as the most capable of keeping pace with the exponential rate of change

depicted" (Trauth-Goik, 2020: 2). All spheres of public life have been influenced in some way by technological progress: "A snapshot of novel and converging technologies includes the Internet of Things (IoT) (a growing number of physical objects with internet connectivity), artificial intelligence and machine learning (process automation), cyber-physical production systems (smart manufacturing), the co-evolution of big data and algorithmic selection applications (a new form of capital), and genetic engineering (reengineering human and natural biology)" (Trauth-Goik, 2020: 3). And the conclusion that the intensity of such influence will only increase seems quite indisputable: "The speed, scope and global connectivity of cyber-physical systems, therefore, heralds great disruption to traditional production models and global value-chains" (Trauth-Goik, 2020: 5).

The author emphasizes the need to develop an up-to-date worldview complex, which will identify fundamentally new ways of verification and activity, as "…the logic presented within the 4th IR discourse reflects a Cartesian-Newtonian worldview predicted upon the separation of individual (business) from the collective society) and the subjective (human actors) from the objective (technology)" (Trauth-Goik, 2020: 17). And it is the worldview that explains the crisis and threatening state of modernity.

A comprehensive analysis of the impact of technology on modern human life is carried out by Thomas W. Cooper (1998). He argues that new technologies significantly change the social order, exacerbate the eternal, and create new ethical problems. The author analyzes 40 significant challenges produced by modern information and communication technologies. However, this list does not exhaust the potential impact of technology on public life, as it is pretty challenging to design possible scenarios of complex implications or untested effects of a combination of new technologies: "Numerous ethical problems such as digital manipulation, impersonation, false advertising, puffery, hype, masking, and data massaging abound. The deliberate and accidental substitution of illusion for reality, and propaganda for proper data, have become far easier. Documents may be altered without detection by long-distance ghosts and realistic, albeit artificial, images may be quickly synthesized" (Cooper, 1998: 74). Traditionally, "…robots and artificial intelligence have long been viewed as the antithesis to humanity and, thus, a threat to human values" (Cooper, 1998: 75). However, these phenomena also realize those values that regulate human life as ways to adapt the environment to human demands and needs.

Technological impact on human life leads to the formation of new formats of interaction. Thus, Pericle Salvini and Federica Lucivero (2017) try to systematize the problematic field of modern ethics in the context of the development of robotics and its impact on society: "Social norms related to robotics are strongly influenced by media portrayals of robots, as robots — more than other types of technological artefacts — spark people's imagination. Images of humanoid automated machines threatening humanity populate Western science fiction literature and cinema. Robots are not simply a piece of machinery. The humanoid appearance and their capacity to sense, process (think) and act seem to make robots direct competitors of human beings" (Salvini, 2017: 20). The authors' team proposes four main regulatory dilemmas caused by the development of robotics: the rapid pace of technological progress, the balance between innovation and traditional rights and values, the content and appropriateness of social norms, the balance of efficiency and legitimacy in technological regulation. Simultaneously, specific modes in public life need regulation, namely: law, market, social norms, and technologies. But how is it possible to normalize the development of robotics and balance human values and priorities in today's man-made world? After all, "Social norms vary in time and place.

With respect to robots, we see clear differences between Japanese versus Western cultures. The Japanese seem to embrace 'all things robotic, from hundred-foot-tall warfighting mecha to infantile therapy robots', while western cultures fear automatons. The difference in attitude is attributed to the Japanese adoption of animism, the notion that all objects have a spirit — even man-made objects — originating from the Shinto faith. As a result, Japanese culture predisposes Japanese to see robots as helpmates. Western culture is more premised on the image portrayed by Mary Shelley's Frankenstein, life created by humans that will ultimately turn against their makers. These cultural biases underlie global differences in people's attitudes towards robots, but also within single cultures, there is polarization" (Salvini, 2017: 21).

Given such pluralism of opinions and assessments, it is not easy to talk about a balanced and consistent strategy for developing robotics and high-tech in general. It is, therefore, appropriate to state that "…the more general lesson is that relevant values need to be elicited in the context of robot implementation. This type of value elicitation, to identify the issues at stake and the values that are debated, is important to avoid impasses in regulation and polarised debates. Tackling this debate is important for regulation because social norms are truly powerful in determining the acceptance of regulation. It is important to acknowledge furthermore that social norms affect the technology that is the object of the regulatory action but is also at the same time influenced by the technology: meanings and values change because of changing affordances. Social norms thus also influence technologies and law, and vice versa" (Salvini, 2017: 25). Based on the ethical principles of responsibility, confidentiality, and autonomy, the authors propose the realization of EU's rights and values, responsible research and innovation, effective regulation, and soft law as means of resolving dilemmas.

Technological progress not only changes the world around us but also affects consciousness, cognitive processes, emotional and social intelligence, mental health, and more. Evonne Miller and Debra Polson (2019) study three technologies, namely: mobile applications, avatars, and robots, and claim the fact of significant transformations in the format of education and other practices of human interaction: "In this time of extraordinary and unprecedented innovation, mental healthcare educators, researchers and practitioners, their professional organizations and regulatory boards must proactively prepare for, engage in, and lead an informed, critical, and thoughtfully reflexive conversation about the potential and perils of these technological innovations that are posed to radically transform the design, delivery, and experience of mental healthcare" (Miller, 2019:6). That is why humanitarian specialists should participate in developing and implementing the latest technologies in public life, as their training provides an opportunity for reflective thinking about the future as a techno-utopia or dystopia.

One of the most famous authors of the future analysis, Yuval N. Harari, considers the fundamental difference between consciousness and artificial intelligence. So, consciousness is always personalized and represents a personal view based on the acquired life experience, and then AI is an algorithm that solves the problem universally and optimally. That is why Yang Lu (2019) calls AI one of the main drivers of industrial progress and, consequently, commodity-market relations. The analysis reveals the specifics of the fundamental algorithms for using AI in the implementation of industrial achievements and the basic concepts of the formation of futurological concepts. But at the same time, the author shares the validity of the concern that the algorithm designed to solve problems of various kinds can rationally identify as the cause of this problem humanity and the way it exists: "The development of AI and large-scale application will also bring a thorny problem: more and more intelligent machines are not only high-tech products, but also affect the rules and regulations of human society. Machine

behavior is at black box status, and prejudice and errors easily get into the system, leading to some ethical issues. When the machine brings new ideas to humans that are different from human beliefs, what should humans do? As more and more people's knowledge and skills are mastered by AI, humans will become more and more scared: they will be replaced by machines, their motivation of learning and working will be reduced" (Lu, 2019: 22).

The problem of AI and the potential risks of its development is part of a more general problem of human interaction with information, with data in a broad sense. Marina Shilina, Robert Couch, and Benjamin Peters (2017) argue a significant public demand for more humane ethics of human-data relations, the need to normalize certain features of their mutual influence, such as anthropomorphic assistance: "Following these articles, an open forum of discussions presents a wide range of pressing issues in philosophy, politics, media and communication studies and research, issues wherein data and ethical behavior cannot be separated: at their heartbeats questions regarding complex interactions between human (including what it means to be human), and the data-lit transformations of those issues where human relations take place (including what it means to be data). Varied contexts are also considered: in public and private, on the streets and in our pockets, in the most mundane details of everyday life, and in the soaring flights of science fact, faction, and fiction. Other topics considered include data and cyber journalism, political marketing where data personalization strategies appear to converge counterintuitively in a picture of conformity, and the very material layer of the cosmos itself — among others" (Shilina, 2017: 238). Accordingly, the development of robotics and AI is already an accomplished and necessary fact in its implementation. And the philosophical discourse about technology and its influence on anthropogenesis is a reflection not so much on the causes but rather on the consequences of possible variations.

The Ethos of the Relationship "Human" — "Machine": The Principles of Interaction

Petr Kopachek (2012) offers his version of solving the moral dilemma about robots' status in a humane and liberal society in the best traditions of applying the dialectical method to resolve contradictions. The solutions are as follows: "1) robots are nothing but machines, 2) robots have ethical aspects, 3) robots as moral agents, 4) robots are a new species that is evolving" (Kopachek, 2012: 69). Such coordinates of robotics in the context of ethics demonstrate the degree of recognition of subjectivity in the mechanisms endowed with AI. Specific measures must be taken at the international level to regulate robotics and AI development and balance technological progress and cultural values. Thus, in June 2019 in Osaka, the leaders of the G20 countries approved a declaration containing recommendations for the development and implementation of "human-centered AI" technologies. These recommendations aim to reduce the potential risks and negative consequences of AI implementation. For the further development of the digital economy, the signatories consider it necessary to use AI to form a stable and inclusive society, strengthen trust and confidentiality, protect intellectual property, reduce the gap in access to the benefits of civilization, and develop "smart" cities.

Like any technique and technology, robotics and AI's functioning means autonomous work concerning humans' will and interests. And suppose the objects and processes of the natural environment do not assume total human control. In that case, technology as a product of human life a priori means the possibility and necessity of predictability and certainty about the effect of activity. The degree of such independence in decision-making with the development

of technology increases significantly. As Michael Heim (1993) and Yuval N. Harari (2013) convincingly wrote about this, metaphysics invade everyday life or algorithmize the solution of eternal problems of ethics. Since modern technical means, such statements are robotics and AI, automatically choosing an important decision or action. The implementation of such algorithms is carried out following certain ethical imperatives (widely known "golden rule of ethics," the categorical imperative of Immanuel Kant, or the laws of robotics by Ayzek Azimov). However, the presence of an imperative of behavior, even categorical, does not reduce many individual empirics' problems.

There is an approach that "…currently there is a mathematical apparatus capable of one way or another to implement the formalism necessary for the ethically determined design" (Karpov et al., 2020). The authors call the main problem of ethical design for technological processes the procedure of verification. They mean the necessity to prepare a set of tests to determine the "degree of ethics" of the system. Significantly, the authors recognize it as a reliable resource for evaluating the system only the observation of its reaction and behavior, or in other words, the method of trial and error.

However, the complexity of the task of ethical design of complex technological systems and mechanisms does not mean the impossibility of its implementation. The Future of Life Institute provides AI risk minimization code by the following principles: safety of use and the ability to determine the cause of failures and problems; autonomous decision-making of important decisions by AI systems must be agreed with the human; designing the limits of AI applications; development of AI systems in accordance with the ideals of human dignity, rights, freedoms, and cultural diversity; fair distribution of economic benefits from the use of AI for all humankind; refusal to use AI in the development of deadly weapons.

In the long run, researchers warn against the limitations of AI systems and their ability to self-improvement and self-reproduction, the global scale of change in society and the world at large under the influence of AI technology.

New technologies are changing not only the world around us but also the inner world of humans. Peter Morhart (2018) considers that AI systems are not just a cybernetic tool used by humans to expand the limits of their capabilities (and technology in general). He meant it primarily as a technology that reproduces mental and cognitive processes: the ability to learn, to build logical reasoning and conclusions, solve heuristic and creative problems. The problem is probably in delegating certain powers to robotic AI systems. The person himself loses the skill of such operations. It is widely known that research programs' development is gradually reducing the need for humans' long-term memory. The intensity of the information field causes the transition from word-text to image-video in communication channels.

A Polysubjectivity of Technogenic Communication

Comprehension of modern technogenic problems and the corresponding socio-cultural transformations is carried out within the Platonic-Aristotelian paradigm of epistemology. Plato's "The Myth of the Cave" prophetically describes the contradictions relevant to our time between the fragmentation of the perception of reality, the conformism of such a habitus, and the need to adapt to the "expanding" information universe. The current volume of information implies the need for a better and faster data processing procedure. Consequently, AI's algorithmic nature is more effective in this respect than subjectivity weighed by emotions and desires. And in these conditions, people become an unnecessary link in the system of accumulation, storage,

and transmission of data. Naturally, the traditional hierarchy of ontology (according to which human is the pinnacle of evolution) is losing its relevance. As a result, there are questions of ethical and legal regulation of the relationship between humans and machines, robots, other forms of life, and the ecosystem in the local and global dimensions. Some thinkers dealing with machine ethics and roboethics call the regulation of robots' presence in our lives more apparent. Network intelligence can pose an extreme danger and a fundamental threat to the existence of human nature since our hopes of mutual understanding between human and machine intelligence may never come true.

In the light of philosophical reflections on the future of high-tech, the reasoning of Ihab Hassan (Hassan, 1977) seems appropriate: one claims that not just an individual of the human race is considered as a subject of life in the modern world, but representatives of other biological forms of life, robots and machines. The actualization of the problem of the rights of inhuman persons is a consequence of anthropomorphism in understanding the world. It is symptomatic that in the subject of high-tech AI discourse is a key, the adoption of AI as an individual and legal entity is a subject of legal contemplation and legislative creativity. This approach echoes the recognition of the corresponding rights for non-humanoid beings and AI, cyborgs, and robots, however, as with environmental ethics and robotics.

An ethical attitude towards nature as a whole becomes an essential step in civilizational development: if we dream of becoming an extra-planetary civilization, ready to communicate with the Universe, we must understand how consciousness evolves in different physical conditions, and first, we must learn to contact those who are on Earth. Some authors believe that "…in such matters, it is important to abandon the conservative view and stop considering, be it animals or AI, simple soulless creatures and machines, claiming that emotions are not a luxury. It is these characteristics, and not the ability to count numbers, that should play a decisive role in deciding the question of "who" or "what" should have the right to a moral assessment. In other words, "scientists also describe the manifestation of various emotional actions in great apes and elephants, and it is quite possible that a conscious AI will also be able to acquire these emotional abilities, which, of course, will significantly increase their moral status" (MacDonald-Glenn et al., 2008: 266).

According to the traditional paradigm of epistemology, subjectivity is defined through rationality. Therefore, the subject of ethical and legal relations can be exclusively an individual endowed with consciousness and the ability to pursue a rational activity. However, modern concepts of ethics offer the criterion of the subjectivity of moral and legal relations, the ability to cause and endure suffering. In this vein, on February 16, 2017, the European Parliament's Resolution on Robot Law was promulgated, including the Charter on Robotics text. In this document, European legislators attempted to regulate the presence of robots in our lives. "The document was intended to decide how people interact with AI and robots, as well as whether it is necessary to endow machines with the status of "electronic human." The developers of the resolution proposed to supply all robots without exception with an emergency shutdown button, and to think about introducing a basic total income in the EU countries against the background of automation and robotization" (State of AI Report, 2020).

But at the same time, many experts are against granting robots the status of legal entities. Their argumentation is based on recognizing humans' subjectivity: the creator-developer of the robot and the fundamental unity of law and freedom, that is, the possibility of independent choice sanctioned by a human.

Suppose the field of robotics develops at the same rate as now. In that case, the need to regulate some aspects of human-robot interaction will appear in a few years. People should not be afraid of being unemployed due to the development of robotics. As for the uprising of machines, AI robots can potentially perform strategically dangerous actions for humans. However, this is still a long way off: today, even the most advanced AIs are created to solve narrow, specialized contextual tasks. As long as there is no AI in the absolute sense of the term, the debate over machines' legal status is unfounded. Therefore, the essence of moral and legal relations is the individual, the human person, or the author-creator of technical devices.

Consciousness in a machine is also an unresolved issue. Thinkers such as Alan M. Turing (1956) insist on the potential for a shift from anthropocentric foundations of ethics to expanding its problem field. At the moment, an affirmation regarding the presence of consciousness and subjectivity in the technological sphere appears, instead, as utopian: "To begin with, AI developers need to create a "basic digital brain" by completing the emulation of the nervous system of worms, beetles, mice, rabbits, etc., these computer emulations can exist both as digital avatars and as robots in the real world. As soon as this happens, these intelligent entities will cease to be ordinary objects of research and will increase their status to subjects entitled to a moral assessment, but this does not mean at all that these simple emulations will automatically deserve the equivalent of human rights — rather, the law will have to defend them from abuse and cruelty" (Turing, 1956: 2121). Since the human brain's mutual conditioning and consciousness remain relevant in our time, the fundamental discourse about the individuality of products of the information technology sphere is logically unverifiable. Therefore, the emotional component of AI's functioning, one's rights and free will, temporality, and empathy can be designed following conditional anthropomorphic patterns.

Accordingly, it is necessary to differentiate the ethical and legal regulation of human activity and the products of his practice. Human rights are the rights of an individual and a citizen. It is hardly an estimate for AI. Simultaneously, the formation of a complex of potentially necessary fundamental rights of robots and AI is based on a particular social request in this regard. There are assumptions about the need to create a personality test for robots, the successful implementation of which will ensure compliance with personal integrity principles, in this case, digital.

The Contextology of Ethical in Digital Culture

The problem of moral and legal relations between human and machine is focused on the following contradiction: on the one hand, a mechanism is needed to protect the rights and freedoms of both human and machine, and on the other hand, restriction (conscious and voluntary) of one's activity in the context of the common good. Besides, if the social justice system is clearly regulated and formalized, how will the injured party's representation in the litigation be solved if such a victim is, for example, an AI or a robot? And by what equivalent or criterion to determine the scale of the damage caused? Also, the system for punishment determining and its implementation does not have any clear guidelines today in the context of a robot or AI subjectivity. In other words, "…once our machines reach a certain level of complexity, we will no longer be able to ignore them from the standpoint of society, institutions of power and law — we will have no compelling reason to deny them human rights. Otherwise, it would be tantamount to discrimination and slavery. The creation of a clear boundary between biological beings and machines will look like a clear expression of human

superiority and ideological chauvinism — biological people are special, and only biological intelligence matters" (Hizhnyak, 2020).

Simultaneously, the granting of civil rights to individual representatives of AI already takes place in world practice: "Methodologically, it would be unreasonable not to mention the robot Sophia, who received the citizenship of Saudi Arabia, which has more rights than the Saudis, because this tech girl has a driver's license (which at the time of their issuance in 2017 were impossible for women in the country), she has the right to walk without a hijab and unaccompanied by men, although this is contrary to the legislation of this Middle Eastern country" (Semenets, 2020). Consequently, these issues are relevant in the general context of social justice and not only on the horizon of a possible confrontation between humans and machines.

Let us analyze the structure of the narrative about the problems of machine ethics. Its identity with the historical discussions about abolishing slavery becomes evident: "Questions of roboethics are discussed related to the ethics of killing a robot that has become too smart and got out of human control. In addition to the right to turn off (kill), sell or give to others, the problem of the connection between AI and sexuality is important, and, accordingly, the question of whether a marriage between a human and a robot is permissible" (Hizhnyak, 2020). Or, "If a stranger tries to destroy your robot wife, can you protect this robot as a family member, or only as property? Where are the limits of necessary defense in this case? Can a property be bequeathed to a robot that received the identity of your deceased spouse? Can robots be given the right to vote, the obligation to pay taxes? Can the results of the robot's activity belong to him? Can a robot buy itself out from its original owner? Can there be a robot without an owner?" (Hizhnyak, 2020).

Are actions such as making a digital copy of a recently deceased person ethical? Will the emergence of such methods of "communication" with information about departed loved ones lead to severe psychological consequences for their loved ones? Some companies want to put deceased people's personalities into robots — there is a demand for "robo-resurrection" or "robotic reincarnation" — a technological procedure for introducing a deceased person's subjectivity into some kind of android-like mechanism.

Our relationship with animals and robots, our view on their nature are changing under the influence of the principle of poly-subjectness as an acceptable and effective format of relationships. The question arises about the trajectory of developing the person's emotional intelligence because of the ever-closer interaction with the "pure" rationality and algorithmic nature of AI and robotics. That is, already now, the procedures of socialization and adaptation of an individual to society demonstrate ones' significant influence on some of AI and other technologies. It is rather difficult to predict the possible consequences of such "creeping" isolation of individuals from society. A particular problem of the current state of society is the phenomenon of everyday life in social networks. On the one hand, the postulation of specific data on existential experience content in the virtual space acquires social verification and legitimization.

On the other hand, it creates a distorted perception of everyday life as an event-intensive process. In other words, all significant events in an individual's life are necessarily presented to the public. The absence of such eventfulness against the background of a motley tape of social networks is often the cause of psychological instability, neuroses, and psychosis. Consequently, the quantitative indicators of data are increasing at all possible analytics levels: from personal to planetary ones.

The development of robotics and technologies of AI is given for the development of "digital culture." In another way, "… soon, when the use of artificial intelligence in the creation of algorithms and programs, solving complex cognitive tasks, styles, literary and folklore genres, musical and poetic creativity of the peoples of the world will lead him to the ability to increase cultural, intellectual, artistic potential independently, to understand metaphors as mathematical models of aesthetic perception" (Malygina, 2018: 49). In other words, in introducing AI systems into the scope of culture, such characters' fragments are aware of all spheres of human life. The cultural space is essentially semiotic; signs and symbols replace real things and processes in their context. Suppose we leave aside the problem of the ontological basis of the sign. In that case, it is possible to consider culture as a whole as a simulative formation, conditional in one's nature. Therefore, the information field as a phenomenon is comparable to the system of reality as a whole. Consequently, the necessary argumentative grounds arise for evaluating ontology as a virtual continuum. And according to this logic, there are simply no advantages of human consciousness over AI systems and the mechanisms that embodied them.

Conclusions

At the beginning of the 21st century, informatization (virtualization, digitalization, and computerization) interacts with most human life spheres. The anthropological potential of high-tech is also increasing and expanding accordingly. High technologies change the world of culture as a sphere of human habitation and the characteristics of the person's mental and emotional-volitional processes.

The principle of poly-subjectness supports the archaic principle of understanding the world through anthropomorphism in the digital era: the relationship to another not based on domination and exploitation, but according to humanity's values, partnership, and solidarity for the common good. With the help of technology, scientists hope to establish communication with animals, study their language and intelligence, use AI elements to help protect the rights of robots and cybernetic organisms.

🕮 References

Asilomar AI Principles (2021) Future of life institute. Available online: https://futureoflife.org/ai-principles/

Chairs Constantine Stephanidis, Gavriel Salvendy, Members of the Group Margherita Antona, Jessie Y. C. Chen, Jianming Dong, Vincent G. Duffy, Xiaowen Fang, Cali Fidopiastis, Gino Fragomeni, Limin Paul Fu, Yinni Guo, Don Harris, Andri Ioannou, Kyeong-ah (Kate) Jeong, Shin'ichi Konomi, Heidi Krömker, Masaaki Kurosu, James R. Lewis, Aaron Marcus, Gabriele Meiselwitz, Abbas Moallem, Hirohiko Mori, Fiona Fui-Hoon Nah, Stavroula Ntoa, Pei-Luen Patrick Rau, Dylan Schmorrow, Keng Siau, Norbert Streitz, Wentao Wang, Sakae Yamamoto, Panayiotis Zaphiris and Jia Zhou (2019) Seven HCI Grand Challenges. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, Vol. 35 (14): 1229-1269, https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2019.1619259

Cooper, Thomas W. (1998) New technology effects inventory: Forty leading ethical issues. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics: Exploring Questions of Media Morality*, Vol. 13(2): 71-92. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327728jmme1302_2

G20 Osaka Leaders' Declaration (2019) Available online: https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2019/06/29/g20-osaka-leaders-declaration/

Harari, Yuval N. (2016) Homo Deus. *A Brief History of Tomorrow*. London: Harvil Secker.

Hassan, Ihab (1977) Prometheus as Performer: Toward Posthumanism Culture? *The Georgia Review*, Vol. 31(4): 830-850.

Heim, Michael. *The Metaphysics of Virtual Reality*. Oxford University Press, 1993.

Hizhnyak, Nickolay. When will robots and AI deserve human rights? *Rambler*. Available online: https://news.rambler.ru/other/37088282/?utm_content=news_media&utm_medium=read_more&utm_source=copylink

Karpov, Valery, Pavel Gotovtsev, and Grigory Roizenzon (2020). *On the issue of ethics and artificial intelligence systems*. Available online: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/k-voprosu-ob-etike-i-sistemah-iskusstvennogo-intellekta

Kopacek, Petr (2012). Roboethics. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, Vol.45 (10): 67-72, https://doi.org/10.3182/20120611-3-IE-4029.00015

Leenes, Ronald, Erica Palmerini, Bert-Jaap Koops, Bertolini Andrea, Pericle Salvini, and Federica Lucivero (2017) Regulatory challenges of robotics: some guidelines for addressing legal and ethical issues. *Law, Innovation and Technology*, Vol. 9 (1): 1-44. https://doi.org/10.1080/17579961.2017.1304921

Lu, Yang (2019) Artificial intelligence: a survey on evolution, models, applications and future trends. *Journal of Management Analytics*, Vol. 6 (1): 1-29. https://doi.org/10.1080/23270012.2019.1570365

MacDonald-Glenn, Linda, and Jeanann S. Boyce (2008) Nanotechnology: considering the complex ethical, legal, and societal issues with the parameters of human performance. *Nanoethics*, Vol. 2 (3): 265-275.

Malygina, Lydia (2018) Chatbots and artificial intelligence: prospects for the development of television promotional discourse. *Actual problems of philology and pedagogical linguistics*, Vol. 4(32): 47-54

Miller, Evonne, and Debra Polson (2019) Apps, Avatars, and Robots: The Future of Mental Healthcare. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, Vol. 40 (3): 208-214. https://doi.org/10.1080/01612840.2018.1524535

Morhat, Peter (2018) On the question of the legal definition of the term "artificial intelligence". *Bulletin of the Moscow City Pedagogical University*. *Series: Legal Sciences*, Vol. 2 (30): 74-80

Semenets, Anna (2020) *Will robots acquire rights?* Available online: http://www.rosbalt.ru/moscow/2017/01/30/1587470.html

Shilina, Marina, Robert Couch, and Benjamin Peters (2017) Data: an ethical overview. *Russian Journal of Communication*, Vol.9 (3), 229-240, https://doi.org/10.1080/19409419.2017.1376529

State of AI Report (2020) Available online: https://www.stateof.ai/

Trauth-Goik, Alexander (2021) Repudiating the Fourth Industrial Revolution Discourse: A New Episteme of Technological Progress. *World Futures, The Journal of New Paradigm Research*, Vol. 77 (1): 55-78. https://doi.org/10.1080/02604027.2020.1788357

Turing, Alan M. (1956) Can a machine think. *The world of mathematics*. Vol.4. 2099-2123.

Veruggio, Gianmarco (2010) Roboethics. *Robotics & Automation Magazine*, Vol. 17(2): 105-109. https://doi.org/10.1109/MRA.2010.936959