Can Artificial Intelligence pose any danger to human dignity and behavior? An ethical appraisal!

Emeka Vernantius NDUKAIHE
Human Rights and Intercultural Ethics (University of Passau), Germany
Psychological Praxis in Logotherapy MA (Straubing), Germany

Opening Remarks

The fear is obvious that artificial intelligence is on the march towards interfering and dictating in human affairs. Is this fear justified? Is this power, which the artificial intelligence is usurping, not a threat to human dignity, identity, and behavior? Is the human being still in charge of what makes them human – their dignity; or must the human being surrender their rationality and sense of responsibility to machines? Who exactly takes responsibility for the actions of these human-made machines referred to as artificial intelligence? Surely, there may be advantages; but to what extent should they dominate humanity? These are questions that beckon for ethical appraisal, which this paper seeks answers to. Our discussions shall proceed as follows:

Focal Points

° The dignity of the human person

° Robotics and Artificial Intelligence (RAI): What are they?

° Which ethical principles are needed in the development and application of RAI to guarantee the inviolability of human dignity?

_____

Prof. Dr. Dr. E.V. Ndukaihe (*Corresponding author*)
endukaihe@yahoo.de

Logotherapist and Psychological Consultant, Straubing Germany, &
Human Rights and Intercultural Ethics, University of Passau, Germany
Tel: +49 1704494041

The dignity of the human person

The concept of the dignity of the human person appears to be clear in its usage, but the real meaning eludes the understanding of many. The first article of the German constitution states in categorical terms: "The dignity of the human person is inviolable. It is the utmost duty of the state and its institutions to respect and protect it." (art.1, §1). In reality, there is nothing higher, deeper, and stronger that can protect the human person and his rights more than a recourse to his dignity. This is because the dignity of the human person is at the same time the major and most outstanding quality of his humanness.

Its apparent clarity notwithstanding, it is difficult to imagine all that the concept of human dignity embodies. Accordingly, a succinct definition of human dignity becomes problematic. The whole ambient of descriptions of the word "dignity" revolves around the negating prefixes "in" and "un": inviolable, unretractable, inalienable, indispensable, etc. as also expressed in German terms: "*un-antastbar*", "*un-einschränkbar*", "*un-verzichtbar*" (Ottmann, 1998, p. 167). However, these concepts, rather than define what dignity is, try to describe it *via negativo* – just like trying to describe God in negative terms: Unending, incomprehensible, unknowable, inscrutable, inconceivable, etc.

A look into the history of the concept of "dignity" reveals an apparent conflict of meanings. In ancient times, dignity signified nobility, majesty and excellence, which suggests a rank or position of distinction. So understood, it is problematic to reconcile this distinction in ranks with the notion of equality and universality of the human person, which human dignity stands for. Accepting the notion of rank endanger the logic of egalitarian status captured in the concept of human dignity. This apparent conflict, however, disappears when the idea of rank and distinction specifically brings out the special attribute of the human person as the bearer of dignity, – in any case, not in comparison to other human beings, but in relation to other corporeal existent. So understood, human dignity means dignity of all humans over and above other corporeal beings.

Problem of definition

The rank and distinction mentioned above can, however, complicate a possible definition of human dignity. Here are some looming dangers:

(1) **Speciesism**: A concept from Peter Singer (1981, 48ff), which proffers special preference to the human species, as if all other living species do not have any atom of dignity or worth.

(2) **Reductionism**: Making sure that nothing, that is human (mortality, finiteness, fallibility – ability to make mistakes, ability to commit crime or do evil – and all other acts of human imperfection), is removed from the content and meaning of human dignity.

(3) **Achievement**: The greatest danger of all is the tendency to define human dignity with achievements. It is typical here to list a catalogue of positive achievements (Autonomy, reason, self-consciousness, morality, etc.) which some people naturally may possess more than others – and thereby leading to classification of dignity.

(4) **Potentiality**: There is also a possibility of assuming those positive qualities based on potentiality. That means, if one does not and cannot prove the possession of those achievement-qualities in the moment, at least a potential possession is attributed and used to define his/her human dignity.

To avoid these dangers, human dignity must be separated in its definition from specific human achievements and abilities. Dignity must be accorded to humans – every human, irrespective of deficiencies, as long as he/she belongs to the human species. This means that

every person begotten from and born of human beings is a bearer of human dignity. So, to say, dignity is an essential element in the identity of a human person.

Having Dignity versus Being responsible for Dignity

The recourse to the biological root of the human species is however not enough to define human dignity. Other living beings also have biological origins. Laying appropriate claim to the entitlement – human dignity – demands a corresponding responsibility from the human person in guarding this dignity. In this sense, human dignity has double implication in meaning which cannot be separated from each other: **having dignity** and **being responsible for the dignity one bears**. Taking responsibility for one's dignity is the role of the subject in the actualization of his/her personality. The emphasis here is on **having** and **being**: It is not just enough to have dignity; one must show it in praxis. It makes a difference when a dog urinates in the kitchen and when a human being does the same: the former cannot take responsibility for its actions, but the latter can and must; their sense of responsibility makes him/her human and consequently a bearer of dignity. Their personality must reflect what he/she claims to possess.

The claim of having dignity is therefore more of a duty to the human species to actualize and uphold her dignity on both personal and collective levels. The concept of human dignity encapsulates this double identity (having and being) and always drags along with it a fundamental tension between both - "*having dignity*" and "*being responsible for dignity*". This tension, however, reduces its intensity when we realize that having dignity is prime. Taking responsibility for dignity is only an *additivum* – a consequence of having dignity, i.e. the responsibility of the human person to make his/her already existing dignity meaningful, appropriate and relevant. This does not suggest however that whoever cannot take responsibility does not have dignity. It categorically maintains that all human beings have dignity and must do everything possible to uphold it.

Summarily, the concept of human dignity does not and cannot rely on the social, political, academic status; or on religious, racial, ethnic and cultural origins. It is rather based on being human (sick or healthy, child or adult, man or woman). On this basis therefore, every human person has equal dignity. And the human dignity remains a substantial element that distinguishes the human person, on account of his rational nature, from other corporeal beings. Human dignity has two stages: **Having** – receiving a dignifying status from a higher being – and **Being** – becoming in reality the dignified person one has received.

Subsequently, the question, "what is human dignity" transforms itself into the question, "what is the specific quality that distinguishes humans from other corporeal beings"? Many philosophers have answered this question differently: The stoics based the human dignity on "*reason*", "*morality*" and the idea that *all humans are children of Zeus* (God). Christian thinkers like Ambrosius in his "*De dignitate conditionis humanae*", trace the special rank of the humans back to his being the image of God. In the Renaissance, thinkers like Pico della Mirandola in his "*De dignitate hominis*" base their arguments on the special God-given ability of humans to develop themselves and their world. Blaise Pascal connected the human dignity with his thinking faculty: "Man is born to think, that is his whole dignity" (*Pensees, Questio, 146*). The most influential articulation of the concept of human dignity in the period of enlightenment was offered by Immanuel Kant in his "*Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals" (trans., 1959*). For Kant, the human dignity defines the human person; it is an "end in itself"; an "inner value" as opposed to a relative value. Kant emphasized here "autonomy and self-determination" as outstanding qualities of the human person in his dignity.

When all is said and done, it is difficult to get a definition of dignity that would satisfy all perspectives of human existence. Any formulation of a definition of human dignity will depend on the perspective from which one approaches it: a religious or secular, theological or renaissance/enlightenment worldview. Meanwhile, all available perspectives and traditions

meet themselves at the sphere of the transcendence. That is why a human dignity whose foundation is ontological has a better status as one existing at the mercy of the subjects.

Human Dignity is Ontological

The concept of a dignity, which the human person possesses from nature and can never lose, and one for which he must be responsible for, is not obtainable without reference to theology or metaphysics. Such level of dignity does not accrue from intersubjective accreditations or stimulations. This is because whatever qualities human beings bestow on each other could also be withdrawn. Whatever humans can give, can also readily be taken away. Dignity cannot be taken away by mortals because it has a metaphysical origin. Its theological and ontological quality transcends what humans can accord themselves. That is why we can talk of its inviolability. If the human dignity were to rely merely on intersubjective endorsement, there is no serious reason why it cannot then be revoked, especially in cases of un-dignifying behaviors. But because dignity is inalienable, every human being retains his/her human dignity even when he/she proves incapable of taking responsibility for it or behaves wrongly. The irrevocability of human dignity relies on its transcendentality. The concept "Human dignity", which is universal and inalienable, is inconceivable outside its ontological foundation. Both human will and autonomy are rooted ontologically in the human person. Once we begin to apply relativity or subjectivity to the concept of human dignity, it loses its ontological status. A humanly inviolable concept must have a transcendental dimension which surpasses the human creative or manipulative competence. And when one closes this window to transcendence, the whole idea of human dignity and human rights would gradually peter away.

Robotics and Artificial Intelligence (RAI) so far still remain at the level of human creation and manipulation, and so must not be allowed to violate the human dignity (which is transcendental) in its applications. Thus, every discussion about the applications of RAI must first guarantee the inviolability of human dignity.

Robotics and Artificial Intelligence (RAI): What are they?

We can describe Robotics and Artificial Intelligence (henceforth RAI) as constructed "machines that are in the position, just like humans, to think or possess higher intellectual and professional capabilities in operation, including the ability to correct its own mistakes" (Tzafestas/Spyros, 2016, p. 25). Today, RAI is being categorized into "weak Artificial Intelligence" (developed to fulfil limited assignments) and "strong Artificial Intelligence" (which is designed to resemble human intelligence or even meant to overtake it in its effectiveness). We cannot explore the wider spectrum of artificial intelligence here. We would rather concentrate our discussion on the ethical implications of their daily applications and how they affect human dignity and behavior. Taking an example from its application in hospitals, we would highlight the dangers of RAI to human interrelationship: in the first place – the danger of replacing human capacities in their functions; secondly – the danger of dehumanizing or isolating patients and leaving them at the mercy of machines; thirdly – the danger of humanizing machines and overrating their competences.

To enhance our understanding of the theme, the following concepts need to be explained: **Geminoid, Android, Humanoid** und **Robot.** In an ascending order, these concepts are, in their entities, parts of a whole (Robotics). One could be developed into another by improving its functions. *Geminoid* is a robot that is formed to look like a real living person. In the *Android* emphases are laid, among other things, on the intention that the robot, through facial features or speech, would be able to make some common human expressions. Above this, the *Humanoid* is a robot built to represent the general image of the human being. All these various aspects are different forms of the phenomenon *Robot*, which is itself a machine programmed to fulfil (sometimes independently) assigned functions.

In the development of a Robot, there are prior known methods of artificial intelligence which are applied, like text and voice recognition, picture and sound processing, action planning and optimization, recognition of emotions as well as analyses of intentions. Meanwhile, there exists (following the already mentioned hospital scenario) many kinds of robots for daily use in clinics: ***Assisting-Robots*** (applied in both physical and psychical ailments (Janowski et al., 2018, p. 64) – meant to support both doctors and nurses as well as patients in different ways; ***Monitoring-Robots,*** which are applied in checking patients, and can even remotely perform surveillance, it can also regulate and remind patients in taking their medications. There are also ***Exoskeletal*** (movement-assisting) Robots, they are attached to the body and gives a patient an ergonomical support. ***Companion*** (***Social) Robots*** also exist, which assist in the emotional and communicative interactions with patients. They are intended to breach the gap of communication, socialize and fight the loneliness of patients. An example is the white artificial Robbe popularly called *Paro* developed in Japan for therapeutic goals. It is used more especially in the treatment of dement patients. In its application, it has been established that *Paro* always stimulates reactions of different sorts in patients – emotional and otherwise. There are many other robots invented for many other purposes. Now, considering their uses and how they are helping in human situations, one should see them as advantageous. On the other hand, when one looks deeper into the operations of artificial intelligence in general, and the roles they are trying to usurp in human daily affairs, one is specially confronted with pertinent questions on how they affect human dignity, identity and behavior.

Open questions with ethical challenges

Every developmental process in RAI raises many fundamental ethical questions. Constanze Kurz, in her analysis of the documents of the French national Committee on Data protection "*Commision Nationale de l'Information et des Libertés*" (CNIL) (Kurz, 2018) pointed out some open questions regarding artificial intelligence, which are worthy of consideration here because they pose some ethical dilemma:

Autonomous machines?

When machines are made autonomous and they take decisions, to what extent can we trust these decisions? Are these decisions from their free will or the will of their programmer? Who takes responsibility for the decisions the machines make? We must think twice if it is appropriate to over-trust the so-called "neutral" and "mistake-free" decisions of these autonomous machines. And how justifiable is it to the dignity of the human person to hand over interpretation of situations, decisions and responsibility of our actions to machines?

Tendencies of Discrimination or Exclusion?

Certain programs could be installed in some systems of RAI that could discriminate or even tend to exclude certain groups of people or individuals in the learning or use of it – for example, in cases of disability. If a programing intentionally discriminates or excludes any group of individuals, it could have serious legal consequences. With our notion of human dignity that is equal in every human being, how do we deal with such situations?

Algorithmic profiling?

There is always an ethical conflict in situations where, on the one hand, software made for individual profiling become advantageous both for the individual and the society as well; and on the other hand, situations where this calculated personalization of software becomes a threat to societal values – like political, cultural, religious pluralism and freedom. How does one tackle such challenges?

Massive collection of Data and its Quality?

To be able to develop a functional but relevant system of RAI, massive collection of data, including personal data, is necessary. Unfortunately, some of those data being collected are abused to serve other ulterior purposes. To prevent these recurrent abuses, however, some states/nations and international communities have made laws protecting the individual's right to personal data, which can, on the long run, hinder the collection of sufficient data for RAI projects. How do we strike a balance to these different goals (data restriction versus data abuse)? Another important question is the reliability of the collected data. Can one really trust and rely on the quality of these data?

Compromising human Dignity Identity and behavior?

In this RAI-age, machines are becoming more autonomous than ever. Some are even developed to exhibit some hybrid forms with humans. How do we go about humanoid robots, which have the capacity of arousing emotional reactions (sexual or recreational), from human beings? Are we not compromising the human dignity, identity and behavior?

In the face of these problems and ethical questions, the already cited French commission (CNIL) offered some recommendations, which should regulate all developers of RAI, companies and citizens:

(1) Everyone who would come in contact with RAI and its systems, whether private or professional, should properly be educated on what is at stake.
(2) All should be computer literate, and computer-systems should be clear and understandable to all, and as well the existing rights and duties should be strengthened and properly communicated.
(3) To improve the efforts in protecting human rights (*liberté humaine*), both the leakages in software systems and the "Black Box" effects must be avoided.
(4) There should be national and international platforms for auditing and monitoring all software systems.
(5) There should be improved incentives for research towards questions on the development of systems of RAI.
(6) Companies must be subjected to adhere to ethical principles and codes, as well as good methods proposed by different ethics commissions regarding the production and use of RAI.

Is Moral Responsibility not a Human Prerogative?

It is so far not disputed that Robotics and Artificial Intelligence (RAI) are machines – human creation and production. Against this backdrop, one would wonder, if the discussions on 'whether ethical responsibilities could be transferred to RAI' are not superfluous. Some authors even use such terminologies like "moral technologies", ascribing to robots autonomous morality. How appropriate is it that technological **objects** should be allowed to assume the state of moral capability which is meant for **subjects**? Peter Kirchschläger (2021) argued against such presumption: Although artificial intelligence could be in the position to follow ethical rules (when so programmed), we cannot ascribe them the moral capability of a human being for the following reasons:

Conscience

Moral decisions mostly take place in one's conscience. A technological product cannot be assumed to have conscience. In human conscience, the objective "*should be*" confronts the subjective concrete human experience in a specific situation and context "*the is*" to induce a

moral decision (Kirchschläger, 2017, p. 152f). The potentials, which RAI in relation to its actions and moral decisions may possess, cannot match the level of human conscience. The human conscience houses morality categorized in different levels, intensities and qualities; in addition, moral responsibility is always affected by personal development and social influence. RAI lacks the capacity to withstand such challenges.

Freedom

Technological products are constructed and developed by human beings. Their production and development are heteronomous and so cannot enjoy independent freedom. If there are ethical norms, which they project, these are regulated by humans. And they are confined in this external determination. In effect, without this freedom, we cannot talk of their autonomy. Humans can create and observe their own moral rules and principles on which they base their actions (Kant, 1974, p. 235f). Such a level of moral autonomy is unthinkable for machines. Although RAI can in its auto-learning-system set rules of operation for its efficiency, these rules have no proof of ethical quality. Machines are primarily oriented towards their practicality, expediency, and effectiveness – in pursuit of the goals for which they are made. They are not free.

Taking Responsibility

There is no doubt that ethical rules could be programmed into the RAI, which could also be trained to operate with it and produce an ethically legitimate action (Wallach, 2009, p. 87); but there is also no doubt that these ethical rules are human transferred rules made in cognizance of the human dignity, rights and responsibility. On the long run, therefore, the ethical responsibility lies on the human. The humans take responsibility in setting and defining the ethical principles, moral and legal norms, conditions of operation, and goals and boundaries of all digital transformations. Since the ethical responsibility lies on humans, the ethical rules and principles that should be transferred into RAI must basically focus on human rights and dignity as legitimized in theological ethics (Kirchschläger, 2019, p. 301f), which is naturally based on its universality, respect of the human cultural and religious plurality, and at the same time ensuring the self-determination of the individual.

No Equality

The human person and a machine, which he/she made, cannot be equal. We have explained above that the human dignity is metaphysical and transcendental. Whatever has this nature cannot be artificially constructed, and above all cannot be equated with any artificial construction. The human being as "homo Dignitatis" (Kirchschläger, 2019, p. 274f) can in no way be as one-to-one artificially digitalized. Not even data-based systems are in the position to replace the whole of human capabilities. They can fulfill one or the other of some human functions but not all. RAI may be programmed to fulfill one or the other human function – even in a similar way, but it cannot be identical with those of human because technological or data-based systems lack fundamentally human passions and emotions.

No knowledge of ethical quality

Data-based systems could be programmed or even taught to observe ethical rules or operate with ethical rules. That is true. But the big question is if they are aware of the ethical qualities of those rules they are following. They would as well follow all unethical rules in the same manner. Their lack of moral capacity constitutes a big challenge for them, especially in the face of divergent or opposing maxims of operation. The growing complexity in daily life demands good apprehension of reality and prompt evaluations and situational decisions, which

one cannot mathematically program into a machine. For example, mathematical solutions know only its calculated result (QED), and no result depends on situations.

Epieikeia

According to Aristotle, *Epieikeia* is "the correction and concrete application of the law, in situations where its general understanding and application has lope-holes" (trans., 1985, p. 14f). *Epieikeia* shows, in reality, that in concrete encounter between humans and concrete situations, rules often experience their limits. This is because life is larger than logic; and concrete situations in their specificness often overshadow the rules. In such conflict situations, the moral virtue of *Epieikeia* is needed. To this effect, Programing and digitalization, RAI in general are impossible in situations, where – like in humans – the virtue of *Epieikeia* and conscience is specially needed.

Dual-use dilemma

We pointed out earlier, that data-based systems could be beneficial in programing but could also lead to abuse of personal data. That means it has the potential of being used both for legitimate and illegitimate goals. In the same way, RAI in general has a dual use problematic, the potential to assist the humans in tackling their impending work-load, on the one hand, and taking over the work-load, on the other, thereby rendering humans jobless. That means, for humans, it could be a relief of the strain of work, or a creation of a societal burden of unemployment. In an ethical discussion like ours, it is perhaps good news to think of less working hours and more free time for humans; but in this case, when less people and more machines are opportune to take part in the effective circle of creation of values and production of goods, then the situation is critical.

Ethical Principles that should guide any development and use of RAI

When developing artificial intelligence, the central focus and precautions should never lose sight of ensuring the protection of human dignity and privacy, self-determination, justice and fairness. One must also not forget the legal conformity of such systems. On the whole, RAI should be a "HELP" and not a "BURDEN" to the human race. With these in mind, developing a responsible RAI demands some basic ethical framework and conditions:

Free from discrimination

RAI must be fair to all classes of the human race. It should be taken for granted that no process of artificial intelligence with data is neutral. No RAI reflects over what it does. It simply does what it is programmed to do. It has no personal morals. Its *modus operandi* is only the structures and data given to it by humans. Now, the question is: Which information is being given; and what is the moral behind it? From the moment of its inception and going through all its stages of production, the variety and diversity of the world in which we live should always be taken into consideration. The database should not segregate, rather it must be ensured to spread across all classes of human beings. That means, it must be rid of the fact popularly known as "unconscious bias". Developers of RAI must be made aware of this fact, so that no class of humans would be disadvantaged or discriminated against.

Reliable and Secure

The reliability of the RAI systems is indispensable for its acceptance. Considering the role RAI plays in human life today, users should not be loaded with the fear of losing any aspect of their information in case of any unexpected short-down or disturbances. In the development of the systems, proof of security and reliability of their products should be a prerequisite.

Privacy

Every human being has a right to privacy in his/her integrity, dignity and identity. RAI, in its production and use, must guarantee and respect this right. Nobody would like to give his/her personal data to the public if he/she cannot be assured that this data is secure, and his/her person protected. RAI must guarantee the right of the individual to decide how his/her personal data or information could be used. One must be convinced that RAI uses his/her personal data in conformity with the legal data-protection-policies.

Barrier-free Inclusion

Artificial Intelligence must be reachable to all. For many of us, it is normal to see, hear, talk, touch, stand or walk. Not all humans are enjoying these privileges. There are more than one billion people with one kind of handicap or the other worldwide. The advantages of RAI must be available to not just the "normal" people but all these different sorts of people in order to acquire some ethical justification. It must consider the different needs of the various classes of the human family. This means in effect, that RAI-Systems should fundamentally be developed in a form that will enable it to understand situational contexts, needs, and expectations of all humans who may use them. The team of developers should be open and diversified (and should even include people with handicap). People with handicap would really enjoy the advantages of RAI all the more if their needs are considered. Through the RAI-systems, their life-situations could be improved. A good example is the Microsoft-App#Seeing-AI, which helps the blind to get movement-orientation in their environment. It can snap a picture of a text and reads it for them or makes a picture of the surrounding and announces to the blind what is around them. Those with hearing-difficulties could be helped with a function which transcribes spoken words for them into written texts (Böhm, 2019).

Transparency

Artificial Intelligence must be fair and in the position to explain the logic and criteria upon which it bases its decisions. Derived conclusions must expose their processes of derivation. Nothing should remain unexplained. Microsoft-President, Brad Smith, opined: "The ethics of artificial intelligence must make the human factor its middle-point. It must be prevented, that artificial intelligence takes anonymous decisions over us – from a so-called "Black Box which we cannot examine or evaluate. We cannot just simply accept its results and follow it blindly" (Smith, 2019, p. 10). As a result of this, results of RAI-Analyses must be presented in a manner that we human beings can comprehend, retrace and evaluate. An ethically justifiable RAI must put us in the position to discover its false decisions and biases, and leave us with the right to do something against it.

Human Responsibility

Many people are afraid that RAI is taking over the control of our human lives and affairs. But the truth is that it depends on us humans to allow it or not. It is the human responsibility to determine the way RAI should work and how far it should go. We have the power to assign its functions, to do what we want and not otherwise. We are the producers. RAI should gain the much influence we are ready to give it. "We should not be deliberating what computer can do; rather what it should do" (Smith, 2019, p. 10). After all, just like all other technologies, it is the humans, who constructed and developed RAI; it should also be human beings, who must take full responsibility for its affairs. This responsibility must specially be emphasized in situations where RAI tends to undermine or damage human rights and dignity. In such cases, the rule must be clear, who (along the processes of production and use) is to take responsibility for any abuse. The human ethical responsibility begins early enough – from the conception of RAI by making sure ab initio that policies are put in place to prevent the scenario that can lead to abuses. All

developing or applying RAI should always be on the alert and follow the laid down norms (legal and moral); and there should also be a body at different levels to examine and monitor the processes and operations of both developers and users.

More Problem-Fields to be addressed

Following our earlier example of a clinic environment, we know that doctors and nurses make a pledge of secrecy in confidential matters. How can one transfer this pledge to Robots and machines? How do we determine among the users, who really has right to the data which RAI collects? (SAMW, 2013, p. 7) Who takes responsibility for the mistakes of RAI and the possible breach of confidentiality? Furthermore, it is often argued that the application of RAI can save time and minimize the load of work on the part of the workers. But the ethical question here is: Has the application of RAI in all honesty its focus on welfare of workers [Sparrow et al. 2006, 143], or on the economic advantages and gains it brings the company?

In an ethical evaluation of a case, one could be faced with another problem: that of "unethical delusion" ("*unethische Täuschung*") [Kreis, 2018, p. 222 f.]. In the interaction with the Robots for example, it is possible that users no longer have the capacity to emotionally differentiate between robots and real living beings. Where is the limit of interaction when the patient is not in the position to differentiate a humanoid from a real human being and begins to exchange his/her emotional feelings with it? How do we ethically evaluate such behavior? Who takes responsibility or who is to blame in such situations? The effects of such situations are enormous and can influence the society at three different levels: *Micro-level* (effects of the action between the person and another individual around him/her), *Macro-level* (the effects of the action in a given society, culture and civilization) and *Meso-level* (effects of the action in wider social networks, organizations and institutions). The German Ethics Counsel (*Deutscher Ethikrat 2020, 9*] advises that every of these levels be intensively considered in the development and application of RAI.

Closing Remarks

To enhance the acceptance of RAI, it must be seen as an innovation that distinguishes and respects human dignity and identity, improves human life standards and brings positive effects to the individual and the society at large. Humanizing robots should be a venture that must be trodden with caution (Kibbel, 2021) since it has the potentials of leading people astray in morals and behavior. By the application of robots, which look like humans, any attributed human behavior should only act as reference. At the same time, it is important to make sure that in the programing, robots do not have to tolerate any human abnormal behaviors, since this can have massive effect in the robot-human interactions.

Nonetheless, the human being is a social animal (*homo socialis*). The many advantages the RAI innovations may promise humanity notwithstanding, it should not be allowed to tamper with human social lives or hamper the "human to human" relations. This warning is pertinent because the danger abounds today that individuals, in their relationships, tend to replace fellow humans with RAI systems. The rate of influence the social media and internet is having on humans, especially on the younger generations, is not to be underrated. This situation poses social and ethical problems. With such networks, we no longer have any influence over the values (morally and otherwise) our youths imbibe. It is alarming to watch our children lose their social character (personally talking to and playing with each other) and prefer internet-charts and video calls.

Furthermore, to address the fear that machines could take over jobs and render humans jobless, it suffices to remind and challenge humans to remain in charge of their products. RAI is a human product, from human ingenuity. RAI should, therefore, be given a clear assignment, categorically stating its limits and defining which aspect of work should be left for human

beings – its creator. In this direction, it is important to insist, right from the conception of RAI that only what one expects from a machine could be programmed in; thereby leaving all human characteristics exclusively for the humans. This will minimize most of the fears of human replacement through machines and on another note eliminate any negative or unacceptable robot-human interactions.

In effect, developing artificial intelligence should be a service to humanity and the society; and should not lead to technical and economic warfare that would put our dignity, identity or the ethical and social norms of our living together in question or in danger. Apparently, ethics challenges our human consciousness, our sense of responsibility, and rationality, to find a way of adapting the technological inventions of our time to our human moral consciousness and values. Ethics demands that we address all that is technically possible with relevant questions that should safeguard the human dignity, interests, and values. While we respect and acknowledge the impact and advantages of RAI in human development, we may not and must not accept RAI-dictatorship. The norms for RAI-behavioral standards must be set by humans, controlled by humans, and the responsibility for them must also be taken by humans. This is to ensure that RAI does not in any way get out of the control of its creator.

In conclusion, ethics demands that we do not follow any development that endangers the dignity and welfare of humanity, her living environment, and our planet earth, blindly. In other words, RAI must be subjected to serve the needs of humans, following her social, moral, and ethical standards and not otherwise. To achieve this, adequate and transparent communication regarding RAI must be put in place so that all fears and doubts, misconceptions, and false assumptions about the mission of RAI can be cleared. In this direction, it would be of help also to create public awareness and organize workshops aimed at educating people about the uses, advantages as well as dangers of the different aspects of RAI systems. The world's technological advancements of today must have humanity in her dignity, identity, wellbeing and survival as the highest priority. This leaves no room for compromise. Our technologies must serve humanity and not the other way round.

References

Aristoteles (1985). Nikomachische Ethik (Nicomachian ethics). *Felix Meiner Verlag, 14*, 26.

Böhm, T. (2019). Künstliche Intelligenz und Ethik: Warum KI ethische Prinzipien braucht, um ein Erfolg zu werden, (Artificial Intelligence and Ethics: Why the AI needs ethical principles in order to be successful) *Microsoft*, 8.

Deutscher Ethikrat (German Ethics-Commission) (ed., 2020). *Robotik für gute Pflege (Robotics for good Health-Care),* 9.

Grundgesetz für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany), Bonn (1949), 8. Mai, Art.1, Abs.1.

Janowski, K.; Ritschel, H.; Lugrin, B.; André, E. (2018). Sozial interagierende Roboter in der Pflege (Socially Integrated Roboter in Health-Care). In Bendel, O. (ed.), (pp. , 63-88). *Pflegeroboter*, Springer Gabler.

Kant, I. (1959). *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals*, Lewis White Beck (trans.), Bobbs-Merril Company.

Kant, I. (1974). Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten (Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals). *Werkausgabe Weischedel. 7.* Suhrkamp, 235ff.

Kibbel, D. (2021). *Vermenschlichung von sozialen Robotern im Pflegebereich, Ethische Aspekte als Einfluss auf die Digitalisierung (Humanizing Social Roboters in the Health-Care, Ethical Aspects that should influence Digitalization)*, Hamburg, 47- 48.

Kirchschläger, P. G. (2017). Gewissen aus moraltheologischer Sicht (Conscience from a Moral Theological Perspective). *In: Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, 139*, 152-177.

Kirchschläger, P. G. (2019). Digital Transformation of Society and Economy, Ethical Considerations from a Human Rights Perspective. *In: International Journal of Human Rights and Constitutional Studies, 6*(4), 301-321.

Kirchschläger, P. G. (2019). Homo dignitatis – Ethische Orientierung im Zuge digitaler Transformation (Human Dignity – Ethical Orientation in digital Transformation). *In: Psychologie in Österreich, 4*(39), 274-284.

Kirchschläger, P. G. (2021). *Künstliche Intelligenz und Ethik*, (*Artificial Intelligence and Ethics*) https://www.gruene-reihe.eu/artikel/kuenstliche-intelligenz-und-ethik/

Kreis, J. (2018). Umsorgen, überwachen, unterhalten – sind Pflegeroboter ethisch vertretbar? (Looking after, Watching over, Maintaining- Are Health-Care Roboters ethical?) *In: Bendel,O., (ed.), Pflegeroboter*, Springer Gabler, 213–228.

Kurz, C. (2018). *Ethische Fragen bei Künstlicher Intelligenz: Mit welchen Herausforderungen müssen wir umgehen? (Ethical Questions in AI: Which Challenges are confronting us?)*, https://netzpolitik.org/2018/ethische-fragen-bei-kuenstlicher-intelligenz-mit-welchen-herausforderungen-muessen-wir-umgehen/

Ottmann, H. (1998) "Die Würde des Menschen, Fragen zu einem fraglos anerkannten Begriff"(Human Dignity, Questions to the unquestioned accepted Concept), *In: Rationalität und Prerationalität* (eds. Beaufort, J. und Precht, P.), Würzburg, 167-181.

Schweizerische Akademie der Medizinischen Wissenschaft SAMW (*Swiss Academy for Medical Sciences* (ed., 2013). *Medizin-ethische Richtlinien und Empfehlungen – Behandlung und Betreuung von älteren pflegebedürftigen Menschen (Medical-ethical Guidelines and Suggestions for the Treatment and Care of old people)*, 7.

Singer, P. (1981). *Practical Ethics*. Cambridge, 48ff.

Smith, B. (2019). (zitiert in Böhm, T., Künstliche Intelligenz und Ethik: Warum KI ethische Prinzipien braucht, um ein Erfolg zu werden), (Artificial Intelligence and Ethics: Why the AI needs ethical principles in order to be successful), *Microsoft*, 10.

Sparrow, R. & Sparrow, L. (2006). In the hands of machines? The future of aged care. *In: Minds and Machines*, 141–161.

Tzafestas, S. G. (2016). *Roboethics. A Navigating Overview*. Springer, 25.

Wallach, et al. (2009). *Moral Machines: Teaching Robots Right from Wrong*. Oxford, 87.

About the Author:
Prof. Emeka Vernantius Ndukaihe
Double doctorate in Ethics and Educational Science respectively
Adjunct Prof. of Human Rights and Intercultural Ethics (University of Passau), Germany
Psychological Praxis in Logotherapy MA (Straubing), Germany