

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND SOCIAL CHANGE: A MORAL AND POLITICAL ANALYSIS

Michael Chugozie Anyaehie

Department of Philosophy, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria

E-mail: mikeanyaehie@gmail.com

Jude Emeka Odoh

State University of Medical and Applied Sciences, Igbo-Eno, Enugu State, Nigeria

E-mail: jude.odo@sumas.edu.ng

Jetty Joe Odey

Department of Philosophy, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Enugu State, Nigeria.

E-mail: jettyjoeodey@gmail.com

Florence Eke Adejoh

Department of Philosophy, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Enugu State.

E-mail: adejohflorence@gmail.com

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence AI is rapidly reshaping the social structures, means of decision-making and forms of authority in contemporary society. Apart from the fact that AI serves as technical tool, its operation simulates forms of agency, sparking curiosity about responsibility, power and the moral limits of the autonomy of technology. The aim of this paper is to examine AI as a moral and political phenomenon by looking at how it affects the way we govern, do business and decide what is true. The paper employs thematic content analysis of philosophical and policy-oriented literature. The paper investigates how algorithmic decision-making challenges traditional sources of legitimacy, trust and democratic participation. The paper argues that current ethical frameworks are not sufficient to address the impact of AI on the society. It suggests a new approach that integrates humanism, anticipatory governance, and posthuman ethics to understand AI's effect on responsibility and power. The paper contributes to the conversation by demonstrating how AI's changes society and what is necessary to make AI align with justice, dignity and fairness. It concludes that AI impact depends on if governance structures can embed these values into technological design and deployment.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Moral responsibility; social change; Critical Humanism; Posthuman Ethics and Participatory Governance

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence AI is gradually being integrated into governance, knowledge production, and economic coordination and doing things humans do. These developments pose serious challenge to established knowledge of technological tools and moral agents. When AI shapes access to resources, influence institutional decisions, and generate claims of knowledge, this, raises the question of concerning responsibility, distribution of power and legitimacy. Therefore, this paper addresses the following questions: how does AI reshape moral agency and political power in contemporary society What kind of normative framework is needed to govern this transformation Scholars have debated on AI primarily through the lenses of moral agency, technological governance and responsibility attribution. In the area of philosophy, scholars have questioned if AI systems can meaningfully be recognized as agents or remain sophisticated artifacts. For instance, Mandy Zafar¹ critiques minimalist idea of artificial moral agency for neglecting reflexive awareness and normative responsibility. Also, Paul Formosa, Hipólito, and Montefiore² accentuate that even though AI lacks the capacity for moral self-consciousness, its behaviour continues to produce outcomes that have social consequence that require ethical examination.

As regards policy-oriented work, UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence pays more attention to governance principles like transparency, human oversight and fairness. Social theorists have also evaluated how technological expectation of the future, stakeholders' perceptions of risk and governance are informed by narratives concerning AI's contribution to societal advancements.³ As Sheila Jasanoff and Sang-Hun Kim, would put it, collective technological futures' sociotechnical imagination is a real material force in policy formation either in the direction of revolutionary optimism from current inequality at the expense of critical voices or Artificial General Intelligence AGI doomsday.⁴ In these circumstances, AI must be regarded as political and ethical, rather than merely technological. And there is a need for a new philosophical position encompassing posthuman ethics, humanism, and anticipatory governance. Value learning and anticipatory ethics hold out some of the more hopeful trajectories for bringing AI into line with human values in the direction of justice and fairness.

Value learning aims at teaching AI to reason and embrace human values like justice and well-being, while anticipatory ethics is about foresight, humility, and proactive shaping of future

^{1.} Mandy Zafar, "Normativity and AI Moral Agency," *AI and Ethics* 5, no. 3 (2025): 2605–2622.

^{2.} Paul Formosa, Inês Hipólito, and Alan Montefiore, "AI and the Relationship Between Agency, Autonomy, and Moral Patency," in *Reconfiguring Human Autonomy: Conceptual Challenges and Ethical Implications in the Age of AI*, ed. Mariafilomena Anzalone et al. (Cham: Springer Nature, 2025), 35–50.

^{3.} UNESCO, *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence* (Paris: UNESCO, 2021).

^{4.} Sheila Jasanoff and Sang-Hun Kim, *Dreamscapes of Modernity: Sociotechnical Imaginaries and the Fabrication of Power* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015), 47–80.

technologies within a humble technological horizon of human beings.⁵ Notwithstanding these contributions, most of the literature discussed AI either as technical governance challenge or as a mental puzzle about agency. Little attention has been given to its will advance relevance as a structural force that reorders moral responsibility, social legitimacy, and political authority at the same time. Current frameworks usually control the impacts without completely explaining how technological agency changes the architecture that underlies social order itself.

This paper argues that AI should be seen beyond being an object of regulation or an agent but as a force that changes how moral and political life operates. This paper suggests the integration of humanism, anticipatory governance and posthuman ethics to tackle this shift. The reason for such an approach is because existing ethics models are not enough for AI's complex impacts, therefore a new approach for the understanding its effects on decisions, power and norms. Without a framework that is capable of attending to these structural transformations, response to AI would merely be reactionary instead of making informed choices. Employing qualitative library-based research and thematic content analysis, this paper examines philosophical and policy-oriented literature on artificial intelligence to indentify recurring patterns relating to issues of agency, governance, legitimacy and social impact.

The remaining sections of this paper proceed as follow. The next section examines philosophical debate concerning AI as Agent or Artifact, clarifying the conceptual foundations of responsibility attribution. The other sections analyses the social and political implications of algorithmic decision-making, with particular attention on governance, economic ordering, and epistemic authority. After which, the subsequent section discusses the proposed normative framework integrating humanism, anticipatory governance, and posthuman ethics. The final section evaluates the implications of this framework for aligning technological growth with justice, dignity and equitable social change.

Artificial Intelligence as Agent instead of Artifact

The philosophical debate regarding autonomy, responsibility, and the nature of action increasingly turns on how artificial intelligence is conceptualized: as mere artifact or as a form of agent-like system. Traditionally, agency has been attributed to only beings capable of acting intentionally, reflectively, and self-directed control. It is on the basis of this, machines, notwithstanding complexity, remain instruments of human will, hence, lack responsibility. However, contemporary development in AI makes this assumption complex by producing systems whose behaviour seem adaptive, responsive and decision-oriented in ways that look like agency. Comprehending this conceptual shift demands attention to be paid to the historical

^{5.} Joanna J. Bryson, "Robots Should Be Slaves," in *Close Engagements with Artificial Companions*, ed. Yorick Wilks (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2010), 63–74.

progress of AI itself. Alan Turing who laid the early theoretical foundations of AI suggests that machine could simulate intelligent behaviour through computational processes. This idea reconceptualized intelligence as something functionally reproducible beyond being limited to biology alone.⁶ AI as an area of formal research was formally associated with John McCarthy. He defined AI as the attempt to create machines capable of performing tasks that would require intelligence if performed by humans.⁷

Initial AI systems depended on symbolic reasoning and rule-based programming, which reenergized the view of machines as sophisticated tools carrying out predefined instructions. Yet, subsequent developments in machine learning changed this paradigm. Rather than AI systems following explicit rules, they began to learn patterns from data, adapt to new inputs, and refine performance over time. Advances in deep learning, autonomous decision architectures and large-scale data modeling have further enabled systems that generate predictions, produce new outputs, and influence real-world results without direct human intervention at every stage.

Organizations such as DeepMind, OpenAI and industrial research environments have accelerated this transition by creating systems capable of strategic gameplay, natural language generation and challenging problem-solving across dynamic areas. These advancements in technology do not establish complete moral agency, however, they produce types of functional autonomy that challenge the traditional classification of AI as a passive artifact.

The tension from the philosophical point of view arises at the intersection between functional autonomy and normative responsibility. If artificial intelligence systems attain the capacity to learn, adapt and produce results that cannot be completely predicted or controlled directly by the creators, then, this will further blur the conceptual borders between instrument and actors. Notwithstanding the fact that AI systems are not capable of consciousness, moral self-reflection, and intrinsic intentionality, its ability to generate socially consequential decisions introduces what may be described as operational agency. This is a form of system behaviour that exerts causal influence within social and institutional structures.

Therefore, the pressing question is not if AI has moral agency in the complete philosophical sense, but if current categories of responsibility and accountability remain sufficient in the presence of technology that helps in decision making. Based on history of AI systems, starting

^{6.} Stevan Harnad, "The Annotation Game: On Turing (1950) on Computing, Machinery and Intelligence". In Epstein, Robert; Peters, Grace (eds.). *Parsing the Turing Test: Philosophical and Methodological Issues in the Quest for the Thinking Computer*, Springer, (2008), 23-66. Introduction <https://www.scrum-ai.com/blog/foreword-by-jeff-sutherland-on-the-origin-of-scrum-and-ai>

^{7.} Jeff Sutherland, "On The Origin Of Scrum And AI," Retrieved January 6, 2025. <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/id/eprint/262954>

with rule-bound computation to adaptive learning systems has increasingly weakened the explanatory adequacy of the artifact model. AI systems are gradually performing functions as participants in structured decision environments more than passive tools as they assume roles in governance, economic coordination, and knowledge production.

On the basis of this, examining AI merely as tools hides the normative relevance of its developing capabilities. The task of philosophy is not to make them humans or anthropomorphise machines, but to determine how technological systems that demonstrate forms of functional autonomy should be understood within moral and political frameworks made for human agents. The movement from tool to agent-like system is not just a technical development but a conceptual change with several implications for responsibility, legitimacy and social order.

Jaime Banks feel that the desire to portray robots as having moral agency does not come from an internal moral capacity of computers but from social misinterpretations of ethics and identity. They contend that rather than being expressions of actual moral capacities, AI's perceived agency is an answer to current social fears.⁸ There are two general approaches to addressing AI ethically, according to the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: either as objects, which raise issues like bias, privacy, and manipulation, or as subjects, who are moral agents in machine ethics (e.g., artificial moral agents). The majority of current AI belongs to the first category: ethically salient tools rather than actors.⁹ They are contrasted with other approaches that, generally hesitantly and in qualified terms, do accord agency-like features to AI systems. Formosa, Hipólito, and Montefiore offer taxonomy of moral, autonomous, and minimal agency. They contend that although current AI is an agent, it is by no means autonomous because it has determinate goals, is not self-aware, and cannot establish a primitive relation to the world outside. They do concede, though, that the next generation of hybrid systems would necessarily collapse such differences, killing off the classical connections between moral patiency and moral agency.¹⁰

The less clear position is supported by empirical research on moral psychology, which shows that people actually do place intentionality and thus moral responsibility on AI. As illustrated in one study, *Attributions of Intent and Moral Responsibility to AI Agents*, an example of negligent behavior by an AI towards harmful outcomes was attributed to much more negative moral judgments. Interestingly, AI beings that were situated in human social networks were rated more

⁸. Jamie Banks, "From Warranty Voids to Uprising Advocacy: Human Action and the Perceived Moral Patiency of Social Robots," *Frontiers in Robotics and AI* 8 (2021): 8670503.

⁹. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, "Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and Robotics," 2023, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-ai/> accessed: 15th February, 2026.

¹⁰. Paul Formosa, Inês Hipólito, and Alan Montefiore, *Artificial Intelligence and the Relationship between Agency, Autonomy, and Moral Patiency*, 35–50.

favorably since they were viewed as an extension of their creators rather than autonomous entities.¹¹ When an AI agent also violates a moral rule, human agents tend to spillover that violation to other AI agents instead of human agents. This effect is called "moral spillover" and happens because AI is thought of as a monolithic outgroup.¹²

Divergent Views: Between the Agent and the Artifact

There are certain theorists who endorse hybrid theories that avoid the all-or-nothing orientation and embrace emergent ascriptions of agency and instrumental genesis of AI. Chatbots and other AI artifacts hold social agency positions. Even if their agency is not anthropomorphic, their socially significant purposes require a unique ethical theory that can address artificial social agents.¹³

Philosophical explanations draw a distinction between moral agency, which assumes ethical respect and responsibility, and instrumental agency, which views AI as only an instrument. Current AI is more of the instrumental type; it acts not because of ethical freedom but based on set rules or optimization objectives.¹⁴ Second, we could consider AI to be intentional systems without necessarily attributing to them moral responsibility on the basis of Dennett's intentional stance arguments. That is, we could treat AI activity as purposive without attributing to it the moral responsibility that moral agency demands (critical deliberation, intentionality, and self-awareness).¹⁵

Moral Responsibility and Power

As Artificial intelligence becomes more capable, the question of responsibility becomes more urgent. Can AI itself be treated as an agent if so, who is morally or politically responsible for its actions these questions are especially difficult in complex sociotechnical systems, where many interactive components shape results. In such environments, traditional models of responsibility no longer work well.

The central issue in modern AI ethics, one of the main problems is accountability gap. This refers to the difficulty of assigning moral or legal responsibility when AI results emerge from

¹¹. "Attributions of Intent and Moral Responsibility to AI Agents," *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans* 3 (2025), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbah.2024.100107>.

¹². A. Manoli, J. V. T. Pauketat, and J. R. Anthis, *The AI Double Standard: Humans Judge All AIs for the Actions of One* (2024), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.06040>.

¹³. Lakshmi Pillai Gupta, The Illusion of Agency-Why AI Isn't Just A Tool, But Also Not Yet A Being, *Human-Ai FuturesHAF Lab* (2025), 1-37.

¹⁴. M. Wanyoike, "Moral Agency vs. Instrumental Agency: Defining the Boundaries," *Medium*, 2025, <https://medium.com/@AIandInsights/agency-unbound-88f26335d186> accessed: 15th February, 2026.

¹⁵. Daniel Dennett, *The Intentional Stance* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1987), esp. 15–30, 65–90.

distributed, opaque, or highly complex processes. When decision-making is spread across designers, data, institutions, and autonomous systems, responsibility becomes difficult to trace clearly.

To clarify this problem, Porter, Ryan, Morgan, Al-Qaddoumi, Twomey, McDermid, and Habli made a distinction between causal, role-based, liability, and moral responsibility. This distinction helps to prevent confusion in ethical and legal argument. It also explains how blame may still be assigned in complex and high-risk contexts, such as autonomous maritime accidents.¹⁶ Despite growing calls for responsible AI, Coeckelbergh argues that the concept itself often remains poorly defined.¹⁷ Without conceptual clarity, appeals to responsibility risk becoming vague or ineffective in guiding policy and practice.

Developers, designers, and users determine the inputs, the features, and the integration techniques leading to AI behavior. Thus, Camilleri contends that they have a first-order moral obligation which ought to be fulfilled through means like systematic auditing, bias mitigation, and inclusive design principles.¹⁸ This explanation is consistent with Floridi and Johnson's control-based tradition, which warns against the anthropomorphization of artificial intelligence.¹⁹ Moral agency should remain a privilege of the human race, as Martin Peterson, Andreas Spahn, highlight: ethical arguments and storytelling require human developers, users, and decision-makers, not machines, as responsible agents (de-ethica). This translation of moral responsibilities into governance requires strong institutional structures.²⁰ Herrera-Poyatos et al. propose a responsible framework for AI based on effective monitoring tools, auditable and reliable technology, regulatory coherence, and accountability mechanisms. The objective of these frameworks is trust and transparency and involves ethics in the whole life cycle of AI.²¹

New governance challenges have been effectively dealt with the advent of AI systems that are well improved to solve sophisticated problems. The area of moral confusion is part where

^{16.} Zoe Porter, Philippa Ryan, Phillip Morgan, Joanna Al-Qaddoumi, Bernard Twomey, Paul Noordhof, John McDermid, and Ibrahim Habli, "Unravelling Responsibility for AI," *Journal of Responsible Technology* 23 (September 2025): 100124.

^{17.} Mark Coeckelbergh, *AI Ethics* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2020), 1–240.

^{18.} Mark Anthony Camilleri, "Artificial Intelligence Governance: Ethical Considerations and Implications for Social Responsibility," *Expert Systems* 41, no. 7 (July 2023): 1–17.

^{19.} Luciano Floridi and Deborah Johnson, "A Unified Framework of Five Principles for AI in Society," *Harvard Data Science Review* 1, no. 1 (2019), 22–25.

^{20.} Martin Peterson, Andreas Spahn, Can Technological Artefacts Be Moral Agents *Sci eng Ethics* (2010) 173:411–424.

^{21.} Michael Mylrea, Nikki Robinson, Artificial Intelligence(Ai)Trust Framework And Maturity Model: Applying An Entropy Lens To Improve Security, Privacy, And Ethical AI, *Scientific Reports* (2023) 9;2510:1429.

humans and machine share some level of responsibility and both producers and users exposed to moral responsibility.²² Hence in order to be able to keep up with the rapid growth of autonomous AI systems there is need for creation and share of responsibility through collaborative interdisciplinarity.

With the development of autonomous AI systems, there is a huge cost of lost responsibility which is demonstrated in public administration. Schmitz and Bryson offer a way that highlight the relevance of designing AI systems that are accountable, transparent and responsive to different stakeholders. This can enhance that AI systems or bureaucracies are legitimate and trustworthy.²³ They present three operational principles which include human responsibility, validation control, robust system and considerate use of AI as an instrument to help achieve institutional goals rather for dubious reasons. They argue that if AI effectively deployed it can bring about better transparency in governance instead of expanding technological secrecy of power. A more hidden danger in AI is the diffusion of responsibility.²⁴ For them, it is dangerous to impute real agency to AI because human disposition to be complacent would make moral judgment a waste. Overreliance on AI gives the impression of AI being flawless as it is full of human prejudice, understating human agency. Amandeep Singh Gill, the UN Secretary-General's Envoy on Technology, underscores co-stewardship on the basis of common purpose at the global level. He is of the view that having a universal standard for AI has potential for promoting accountability, fairness and transparency in the creation and use of AI. At the same time it will ensure that the benefits of AI are fairly shared among all nations irrespective of their economic and political powers.

The Non-Linearity and Complexity of AI's Impact on Social Transformation

Artificial intelligence (AI) is more than a tool for the performing pre-defined tasks; it is a disruptive agent that is transforming societal ordering, governance, cultural meaning, and even everyday rhythms of life. Its effects are not linear or gradual. They are complex, heterogeneous, and even sudden. Social systems reorganize through adaptation, feedback loops, and emergent patterns, such as other complex adaptive systems (CAS). Because of this, governance cannot remain rigid or purely hierarchical.²⁵

^{22.} Adriana Salatino, Arthur Prevel, Emilie Caspar Salvatore Lo Bue, Influence of Ai Behavior on Human Moral Decisions, Agency, And Responsibility, *Scientific Reports* 2025 15:12329

^{23.} Salatino, Arthur Prevel, Emilie Caspar Salvatore Lo Bue, Influence of Ai Behavior on Human Moral Decisions, Agency, And Responsibility, *Scientific Reports* , 12329

^{24.} Salatino, Arthur Prevel, Emilie Caspar Salvatore Lo Bue, Influence of Ai Behavior on Human Moral Decisions, Agency, And Responsibility, *Scientific Reports*, 12329

^{25.} Hanna Bleher Mathias Braun, Diffused Repsonsibility: Attributions of Responsibility in The Use of Ai-Driven Clinical Decision Support Systems, *AI and Ethics* 2022 2:747-761.

Governance scholars argue that regulations must evolve alongside adaptive, multi-agent interactions. Evolutionary Governance Theory is an excellent theoretical framework to make educated guesses regarding the influence of AI on collaborative endeavors such as Wikipedia. It conceives governance as co-evolving systems where actor, institution, discourses evolve together. As AI advances, institutions, and discourses must become stronger, more robust to manage systemic interdependence and limited transparency in algorithmic decision-making. The traditional governance models, built on linear hierarchies, are poorly suited to this complex and risk failure if they are not reconfigured. What is necessary is decentralized and adaptive, and normatively controlled governance systems that can function effectively within socio-technical systems.²⁶

AI already has a noticeable effect on politics, culture, and the economy. From a business standpoint, AI increases productivity, speeds up business responsiveness, and simplifies labor processes. But these advantages are normally associated with the disruption of workers and changing the culture since workers complain to lose their jobs and resist corporate explanations. AI is reengineering public life by influencing the behavioural patterns and social interactions. For instance, through the use AI to run behaviour analysis, it was discovered in one of the locations being studied that 15 of the people walk with quicker strides and discuss less on sidewalks and in other public areas currently than earlier decades. Based on the report of the Guardian, by accepting a human-centered approach to AI city design, a more responsive public space that response to the needs of the city and that promote social well-being and community engagement can be created.²⁷

However, bringing AI into politics can create deep division, wear out trust and bring about an artificial state that gives room for algorithmic domination rather than proper democratic interactions.²⁸ Nevertheless, according to Wired, AI can be used to offer reparations and protection of vulnerable groups by lowering discrimination. From the global governance perspective, scholars warn that poorly designed AI laws may reinforce colonial disparities.²⁹ This highlights the need for the production of technologies and laws that are inclusive in nature and

^{26.} Hanna Bleher Mathias Braun, Diffused Repsonsibility: Attributions of Responsibility in The Use of Ai-Driven Clinical Decision Support Systems, 747-761.

^{27.} Mike Zajko, Artificial Intelligence, Algorithms, And Social Inequality: Sociological Contributions to Contemporary Debates, *Sociology Compass* 2022 Volume 16, Issue 3/E12962

^{28.} `Max Trotter, Opportunities and Challenges of AI-Systems in Political Decision-Making Contexts, *Front. Polit. Sci.* (2025) 7:1504520.

^{29.} Mohamed, S., Png, M.-T., and Isaac, W., Decolonial AI: Decolonial Theory as Sociotechnical Foresight in Artificial Intelligence, *Philosophy & Technology* 33, no. 4 (2020): 659–684.

take into account the realities of the global south.³⁰

Algorithmic Governance and Democratic Legitimacy

Democratic legitimacy is immediately put into question when public authorities use machine learning (ML) to make decisions or provide advice. Erman and Furendal hold the viewpoint that judgments must be democratically sound if and only if they are meant for legislative ends, justifiable in the public arena, and open to democratic scrutiny. By hiding their reasoning processes behind a veil, black-box AI systems hide their conclusions from democratic oversight and disempower their legitimacy.³¹ One must have faith in technology and institutions to practice democracy. While collateral interests set limits on public trust in technology firms, Bullock et al. highlight that public trust in government is typically vulnerable to the desire for regulation.³²

Still more radical are Jungherr and Rauchfleisch, who detect a "AI penalty," in which people are intimidated by civic spaces enabled by AI and feel AI-facilitated conversations are poorer quality, and therefore do not arrive.³³ Citizens, according to Ingrams, view decisions by AI, e.g., tax decisions, to be less effective though more efficient.³⁴ Measurement of bureaucratic justice is made challenging by this efficacy-equality dilemma.³⁵ Misleading information spreading through AI is another reason to be concerned. By overwhelming political discourse with specially crafted deception, generative models can bias debate and sway votes. Citizens distrust the media and government when they are unable to separate manipulation from actual communication.

Poor laws or too little oversight, too much control by technical experts, AI making everyday decision without supervision, exclusion of certain groups can lead to loss of trust in institutions and feeling of disconnection from democracy. Some examples of how poorly designed systems exacerbate discrimination and distrust include content moderation shortfalls in Myanmar, exclusion from financial services in Kenya, and algorithmic mismanagement in Ethiopia. For Sztompka, "institutionalized distrust" can paradoxically help re-legitimate by reaffirming open

^{30.} Chatham House, *Artificial Intelligence and the Challenge for Global Governance: An Ethics Framework for the AI-Generated Future* (2024).

^{31.} Petter N. Erman and Fredrik Furendal, "Democracy and Algorithmic Decision-Making," *Government Information Quarterly* 37, no. 2 (2020): 101–112.

^{32.} Jonathan Bullock, Sophie Y. Jungherr, and Sebastian Rauchfleisch, "AI and Public Trust: The Perils of Automation in Civic Spaces," *Policy & Internet* 12, no. 3 (2020): 389–410.

^{33.} Andreas Jungherr and Adrian Rauchfleisch, *Artificial Intelligence In Deliberation: The AI Penalty and The Emergence of A New Deliberation Divide* ArXiv volume 42, issue 4 (2025), 102079.

^{34.} Michael Ingrams, "Efficiency Versus Effectiveness," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 31, no. 1 (2021): 45–62.

^{35.} Michael Ingrams, "Efficiency Versus Effectiveness," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 31, no. 1 (2021): 45–62.

justification, accountability, and human agency within AI rule-making processes. While such risks are present, there are also encouraging ways of reconciling AI with democratic rule.³⁶ Also, Overney offers ways and means that will bring about authenticity and accountability by promoting public participation, through the complementarity of human engagement and AI effectiveness.³⁷

AI Enhancing Human Flourishing or Structural Inequality

The most important political and ethical issue bedeviling the world currently is the complexity that comes with AI systems. The issue is whether AI will be deployed to enhance human flourishing or create more serious structural inequality. This unanticipated tension is a natural byproduct of the technology's design, deployment, and regulation. Philosophically, "flourishing" would mean the Aristotelian eudaimonia as an integrated form of well-being based on relational justice, dignity, and meaning. The following values can be augmented by AI if properly implemented: Topol states that artificial intelligence (AI) has the capacity to improve health and longevity through precision medicine, prevention of disease outbreaks, and diagnosis improvement.³⁸ All socio-economic strata enjoy greater access to quality education through adaptive AI-driven learning.³⁹ Smart urban planning, climatic forecasting, and energy efficiency are improved through AI-based solutions.⁴⁰ Individuals with disabilities are empowered by assistive AI technologies such as voice or limb control and interpretation, and technology is an agent of equity and justice.⁴¹

With Amartya Sen's human development theory assuming that technology could be used to increase freedom through well-working institutions, the information available here show how AI can be used to increase capacity growth.⁴²

It is possible for AI to aid in solving deep rooted systemic injustice if made to function without ethical limitations. Also, by training algorithms with biased data, the issues of socioeconomic inequalities, gender and race can become worse. Study shows that darker faces have a higher outcome rate of face recognition technology error. This is legally and morally questionable

^{36.} Piotr Sztompka, *Trust: A Sociological Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 63–72.

^{37.} David Overney, "Enhancing Accountability through Human–AI Complementarity," *AI & Society* 35, no. 4 (2020): 937–50.

^{38.} Eric Topol, *Deep Medicine: How Artificial Intelligence Can Make Healthcare Human Again* (New York: Basic Books, 2019), 112–145.

^{39.} Rose Luckin, *Machine Learning and Human Intelligence: The Future of Education for the 21st Century* (London: UCL Press, 2017), 15–24.

^{40.} David Rolnick et al., Tackling Climate Change with Machine Learning, *Nature Climate Change* 12 (2022): 1–9.

^{41.} Huang, G., Raghunathan, A., and Priya, A., AI for Accessibility: Advances and Challenges, *ACM Transactions on Accessible Computing* 13, no. 2 (2020), article 5.

^{42.} Amartya Sen, *Development as Freedom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 38–57.

according to Buolamwini Gebru.⁴³ As Zuboff (2019) is quoted criticizing, AI data extraction robs democratic freedom and privacy and concentrates corporate monopolies' hands with power.⁴⁴ The creation of AI is still disproportionately performed in the Global North. As Mohamed, Png, and Isaac (2020) suggested, unless decolonial AI policies are implemented, technology regulation will further entrench colonial power inequalities and silence the Global South.⁴⁵ Frey and Osborne (2017) contend that up to 47% of American jobs might be replaced by automation. Though new job categories will emerge, the transition might exacerbate inequality, particularly in nations with poor social safety nets.⁴⁶ This is a distributive justice question of who benefits and harms from AI.

John Rawls's theory of justice gives us the difference principle, a normative theory of how to use the criteria to deploy AI that demands social arrangements to be maximally good for the least advantaged.⁴⁷ AI systems pass the moral test so far as they make currently existing groups more vulnerable. By guaranteeing achievement for certain knowledge systems at the cost of disenfranchisement of others, critical theorists similarly argue that AI amplifies epistemic and economic inequality. This supports the argument advanced by Fricker that traditionally oppressed individuals are deprived of a voice in the same technology that governs their existence, an argument identified as epistemic injustice.⁴⁸ Artificial intelligence has demonstrated unmitigated potential in African health systems, especially in the early diagnosis of COVID-19 and malaria, where it will save thousands of lives.

There are gigantic infrastructure obstacles in spite of all these advancements. These technologies are not accessible to the communities that would gain from them the most due to digital divides and poor infrastructure.⁴⁹ There are other places where the same paradox applies. For example, AI-based predictive policing has raised serious ethical issues in the US. According to research,

^{43.} Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru, "Gender Shades: Intersectional Accuracy Disparities in Commercial Gender Classification," *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research* 81 (2018): 1–15.

^{44.} Shoshana Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2019), 210–236.

^{45.} Rohini Mohamed, Ivan Png, and Isaac A. Isaac, "Decolonial AI: Rethinking Technology for Global Justice," *AI & Ethics* 1, no. 3 (2021): 283–94.

^{46.} Carl Benedikt Frey and Michael A. Osborne, "The Future of Employment: How Susceptible Are Jobs to Computerisation?" *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 114 (2017): 254–80.

^{47.} John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971), 60–75.

^{48.} Miranda Fricker, *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 23–45.

^{49.} Chilton, S., Jansen, M., and Osei, B., "AI for Health in Africa: Opportunities and Challenges," *Journal of Global Health* 11 (2021): 04049.

such systems over-predictively target marginalized groups and prioritize imprisonment over genuine public safety.⁵⁰ Obviously, finance is another example.

Certain people now have greater access to finance through tools like algorithmic trading and automated credit scoring, while others who do not use the internet remain behind. Though introduced as mechanisms to promote inclusivity, they end up perpetuating existing inequalities.⁵¹ To repair these contradictions, legislation based on the moral philosophies of justice, equality, and dignity must be formulated. FAT framework provides the foundation to infuse ethical design in algorithmic systems and translates to fairness, accountability, and transparency. Furthermore, it is crucial to ensure the potential of world inclusion through enhanced participation and the application of decolonial values on AI governance. The inequalities created by AI technology have been met with the proposal of redistributive methods such as the universal basic income (UBI) or even algorithmic reparations.⁵² Finally, promoting cultural diversity must be actively pursued. In order for technology to work for the various worlds of the globalized world and not just the hegemonic, this entails the creation of AI systems that are based on diverse epistemologies, social environments, and languages.

Posthuman Ethics, Humanism, and Anticipatory Governance

Instead of AI as a technological phenomenon, the abstract treats it as an ethical and political phenomenon that requires new philosophical imagination. Such a notion can be expressed through three interconnected lenses: posthuman ethics, humanism, and anticipatory governance. The normative basis upon which to evaluate AI in terms of justice, fairness, or dignity is provided by these lenses in convergence. Relational justice, human dignity, and agency are all issues of concern to critical humanism in technology control and design. Humanism departs from classical humanism in recognizing power disparities, structural marginalization, and unattained human freedom.⁵³ For AI, system deployment and design need to be based on the axiomatic premise of human dignity.⁵⁴

In a bid to prevent unequal access to the advantages of AI, solution justice must factor algorithmic discrimination.⁵⁵ AI must be welcoming diverse knowledge traditions rather than merely the

^{50.} Kristian Lum and William Isaac, "To Predict and Serve?" *Significance* 13, no. 5 (2016): 14–19.

^{51.} Cathy O'Neil, *Weapons of Math Destruction* (New York: Crown, 2016), 90–135.

^{52.} Greg Demirchyan, Algorithmic Fairness: Challenges To Building An Effective An Effective Regulatory Regime, *Frontiers In Artificial Intelligence*, (2021), 8:1637134.

^{53.} Walter Dignolo, *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options* (Duke University Press, 2011), 1-23.

^{54.} UNESCO, *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence* (Paris: UNESCO, 2021).

^{55.} Ruha Benjamin, *Race After Technology* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2019), 55–90.

technocratic or Eurocentric ones.⁵⁶ Hence, neither techno-optimism nor techno-determinism scares critical humanism. Human beings ought to possess the moral right to decide whether or not AI is beneficial for the general populace over simply just wealthy elites. Hard human-machine dualism is ruled out by posthuman ethics. Writers such as Braidotti are of the belief that the posthuman condition places human beings, technology, and the environment into interwoven sets of agency that transcend seeming divides.⁵⁷ Posthuman ethics in AI refers to the fact that, while AI technologies are not moral beings in and of themselves, they are agent-like events that coordinate behavior, organization, and decision-making.

Accordingly, institutions, designers, and users all have some of the blame.⁵⁸ It is not whether AI can be moral that should concern us, but rather how human-AI interactions will provide justice, compassion, and accountability.⁵⁹ As Formosa, Hipólito, and Montefiore have it, humanity needs to hold on to its humility and eschew anthropocentric hubris and technophilic abdication, as AI will ultimately stand for hybrid modalities of agency.⁶⁰ A more elevated moral imagination capable of embracing nonhuman agents within our political and moral imagination is what posthuman ethics will have to adopt, not the dismissal of human accountability. To respond to novel and emerging technologies, anticipatory governance is forward-looking, open, and proactive.⁶¹ Instead of being a reaction after the damage has been caused, it must involve responsiveness, participation, and foresight.

Through tools like futures studies and technology assessment, the most critical skill is the potential to look forward and see possibilities and risks before they are being acted upon.⁶² To assist in shifting the debate from experts to citizens for the purpose of AI policymaking and norms framing. Civic spaces such as Taiwan's digital democracy demonstrate how AI policy can be democratic as well as progressive.⁶³ According to Cath, policy and legislation should be adaptable enough to meet new challenges without limiting creativity.⁶⁴ Predictive governance

^{56.} Mohammed, Png, and Isaac, "Decolonial AI: Rethinking Technology for Global Justice," 2020.

^{57.} Rosi Braidotti, *The Posthuman* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013), 1–35.

^{58.} Mark Coeckelbergh, *AI Ethics* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2020), 1–240.

^{59.} Luciano Floridi and Josh Cowls, "A Unified Framework of Five Principles for AI in Society," *Harvard Data Science Review* 1, no. 1 (2019).

^{60.} Paul Formosa, Inês Hipólito, and Alan Montefiore, *Artificial Intelligence and the Relationship between Agency, Autonomy, and Moral Patiency*, 35–50.

^{61.} David Guston, "Understanding Anticipatory Governance," *Social Studies of Science* 44, no. 2 (2014): 218–242.

^{62.} Jack Stilgoe, Richard Owen, and Phil Macnaghten, "Developing a Framework for Responsible Innovation," *Research Policy* 42, no. 9 (2013): 1568–1580.

^{63.} Audrey Tang, *Plurality: The Future of Collaborative Democracy* (MIT Civic Media Lecture Series, 2020), 2.

^{64.} Corinne Cath, "Governing Artificial Intelligence: Ethical, Legal and Technical Opportunities and Challenges," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A* 376, no. 2133 (2018): 20180080.

conveys the idea of anticipatory ethics as mapped by Lazar, whereby the trajectory of AI must be guided into a temporality that human beings can approach with reluctance and humility.⁶⁵ The three strategies, critical humanism, posthuman ethics, and anticipatory governance are employed as a package rather than against one another: Critical humanism defends dignity, justice, and parity. Extended moral imagination and posthuman ethics consider co-entangled agency. Enfranchisement in democracy and prescience are made legal through anticipatory government.

They are part of a new political and ethical vision for AI beyond determinism and in favor of values, so that technological progress will never fall behind the diversity and complexity of existing and potential generations. No more than its calculative ability, AI possesses revolutionary power to reform moral space. Classical ethics of free human agents must make human-machine coexistence possible, in which people and machines collaborate to construct the world. There is civilizational introspection to be superimposed on mastery of technology: how would we want to live with robots having our own vision, our own judgment, and our own action? As Hannah Arendt warned in 1958, technological advancement changes the "terms of human existence."⁶⁶ The ethical question is how to use AI technology for freedom or power. An agonistic, posthuman, and futural philosophy of AI is demanding the latter.

Conclusion

AI is not just another technology; it is additionally a political and ethical phenomenon that is reshaping the most fundamental aspects of human life. The excerpts mentioned above show the way AI complicates distinguishing an actor from an artifact and raises profound questions regarding accountability, legitimacy, and the ethics of power. It personifies both the danger of structural injustice as discrimination in algorithms, surveillance capitalism, and displacement face dignity and justice, as well as humanity's desire for prosperity, through improved sustainability, health, education, and openness. This dual nature makes it clear that artificial intelligence has worth. Technology can "enframe" human life, establishing the fundamental parameters on which we exist and move about in the world, Heidegger cautioned.⁶⁷ With AI so much now acting with purpose-like intent, creating information, anticipating future paths, and inserting itself into decision-making judgments previously controlled by human judgment, the danger grows ever greater. What is required in the presence of the revolutionary potential of AI is a new mode of thinking, not a technological workaround.

The integrated perspectives of anticipatory governance, posthuman ethics, and humanism constitute an entire answer. In the first place, critical humanism advocates for the reinstatement of

^{65.} J. Lazar, "Predictive Governance and Anticipatory Ethics," *Ethics and Information Technology* 24, no. 3 (2022): 387–403.

^{66.} Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), 179–210.

^{67.} Martin Heidegger, *The Question Concerning Technology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1977), 3–35.

justice, human dignity, and agency participation against technological rationality's reductionism. In the second place, through embracing intertwined agencies by which humans and technologies fashion social worlds together and blend certain boundaries between them, posthuman ethics expands the moral imagination. Third, anticipatory governance ensures that AI is created with humility, forethought, and participatory legitimacy by resetting the focus from responsive structures to anticipatory design. The combination of anticipatory governance, posthuman ethics, and critical humanism offers an all-inclusive solution.

First, humanism necessitates reinstalling justice, human dignity, and participatory agency against technological rationality reductionism. Second, by seeing interpenetrating agencies where people and technologies collaboratively produce social worlds and eliminate clean lines between them, posthuman ethics expands the moral imagination. Third, anticipatory governance ensures AI is designed with humility, foresight, and democratic legitimacy by refocusing the spotlights from responsive schemes to anticipatory design. A new technological humanism of justice, equality, and dignity, one that enhances freedom rather than eroding it, can be begun through AI.

Finally, AI returns human civilization to the age-old philosophical question of how to coexist in new form. The algorithms are not the magic word to the answer; rather, the design, regulation, and societal integration of the algorithms are shaped by political and ethical choices. Our values will govern future AI development. Either it will build a technological Renaissance that continues to grow human prosperity, or it will build a digital feudalism that balances inequity and power. The choice is ours.

Bibliography

- Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Banks, Jamie. "From Warranty Voids to Uprising Advocacy: Human Action and the Perceived Moral Patency of Social Robots." *Front Robot AI* 28 (2021): 8670503.
- Benjamin, Ruha. *Race After Technology*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2019.
- Bleher, Hanna, and Mathias Braun. "Diffused Responsibility: Attributions of Responsibility in the Use of AI-Driven Clinical Decision Support Systems." *AI and Ethics* 2 (2022): 747–761.
- Braidotti, Rosi. *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013.
- Bryson, Joanna J. "Robots Should Be Slaves." In *Close Engagements with Artificial Companions*, edited by Yorick Wilks, 63–74. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2010.
- Bullock, Jonathan, Sophie Y. Jungherr, and Sebastian Rauchfleisch. "AI and Public Trust: The Perils of Automation in Civic Spaces." *Policy & Internet* 12, no. 3 (2020): 389–410.
- Camilleri, Mark Anthony. "Artificial Intelligence Governance: Ethical Considerations and Implications for Social Responsibility." *Expert Systems* 41, no. 7 (July 2023): 1–17.
- Cath, Corinne. "Governing Artificial Intelligence: Ethical, Legal and Technical Opportunities

- and Challenges.” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A* 376, no. 2133 (2018): 20180080.
- Chatham House. *Artificial Intelligence and the Challenge for Global Governance: An Ethics Framework for the AI-Generated Future*. 2024.
- Chilton, S., M. Jansen, and B. Osei. “AI for Health in Africa: Opportunities and Challenges.” *Journal of Global Health* 11 (2021): 04049.
- Coeckelbergh, Mark. *AI Ethics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2020.
- Demirchyan, Greg. “Algorithmic Fairness: Challenges to Building an Effective Regulatory Regime.” *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* 8 (2021): 1637134.
- Dennett, Daniel C. *The Intentional Stance*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1987.
- Erman, Petter N., and Fredrik Furendal. “Democracy and Algorithmic DecisionMaking.” *Government Information Quarterly* 37, no. 2 (2020): 101–112.
- Floridi, Luciano, and Deborah Johnson. “A Unified Framework of Five Principles for AI in Society.” *Harvard Data Science Review* 1, no. 1 (2019).
- Floridi, Luciano, and Josh Cowls. “A Unified Framework of Five Principles for AI in Society.” *Harvard Data Science Review* 1, no. 1 (2019).
- Formosa, Paul, Inês Hipólito, and Thomas Montefiore. “AI and the Relationship Between Agency, Autonomy, and Moral Patiency.” In *Reconfiguring Human Autonomy: Conceptual Challenges and Ethical Implications in the Age of AI*, edited by Mariafilomena Anzalone et al., 35–50. Cham: Springer Nature, 2025.
- Frey, Carl Benedikt, and Michael A. Osborne. “The Future of Employment: How Susceptible Are Jobs to Computerisation?” *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 114 (2017): 254–280.
- Guston, David. “Understanding Anticipatory Governance.” *Social Studies of Science* 44, no. 2 (2014): 218–242.
- Gupta, Lakshmi Pillai. “The Illusion of Agency-Why AI Isn't Just a Tool, But Also Not Yet a Being.” *Human-AI Futures* (HAF) Lab, 2025, 1–37.
- Harnad, Stevan. “The Annotation Game: On Turing (1950) on Computing, Machinery and Intelligence”. In Epstein, Robert; Peters, Grace (eds.). *Parsing the Turing Test: Philosophical and Methodological Issues in the Quest for the Thinking Computer*, Springer, 2008, 23-66. Introduction <https://www.scrum-ai.com/blog/foreword-by-jeff-sutherland-on-the-origin-of-scrum-and-ai>
- Heidegger, Martin. *The Question Concerning Technology*. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.
- Huang, G., A. Raghunathan, and A. Priya. “AI for Accessibility: Advances and Challenges.” *ACM Transactions on Accessible Computing* 13, no. 2 (2020): article 5.
- Ingrams, Michael. “Efficiency Versus Effectiveness.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 31, no. 1 (2021): 45–62.
- Jasanoff, Sheila, and SangHun Kim. *Dreamscapes of Modernity: Sociotechnical Imaginaries and the Fabrication of Power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015.

- Jungherr, Andreas, and Adrian Rauchfleisch. "Artificial Intelligence in Deliberation: The AI Penalty and the Emergence of a New Deliberation Divide." *arXiv* 42, no. 4 (2025): 102079.
- Lazar, J. "Predictive Governance and Anticipatory Ethics." *Ethics and Information Technology* 24, no. 3 (2022): 387–403.
- Lum, Kristian, and William Isaac. "To Predict and Serve?" *Significance* 13, no. 5 (2016): 14–19.
- Luckin, Rose. *Machine Learning and Human Intelligence: The Future of Education for the 21st Century*. London: UCL Press, 2017.
- Manoli, A., J. V. T. Pauketat, and J. R. Anthis. *The AI Double Standard: Humans Judge All AIs for the Actions of One*. 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.06040>.
- Mignolo, Walter. *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011.
- Mohamed, Rohini, Ivan Png, and Isaac A. Isaac. "Decolonial AI: Rethinking Technology for Global Justice." *AI & Ethics* 1, no. 3 (2021): 283–294.
- Mohamed, S., M.-T. Png, and W. Isaac. "Decolonial AI: Decolonial Theory as Sociotechnical Foresight in Artificial Intelligence." *Philosophy & Technology* 33, no. 4 (2020): 659–684.
- O'Neil, Cathy. *Weapons of Math Destruction*. New York: Crown, 2016.
- Overney, David. "Enhancing Accountability through Human–AI Complementarity." *AI & Society* 35, no. 4 (2020): 937–950.
- Peterson, Martin, and Andreas Spahn. "Can Technological Artefacts Be Moral Agents?" *Science and Engineering Ethics* 17, no. 3 (2010): 411–424.
- Porter, Zoe, Philippa Ryan, Phillip Morgan, Joanna AlQaddoumi, Bernard Twomey, Paul Noordhof, John McDermid, and Ibrahim Habli. "Unravelling Responsibility for AI." *Journal of Responsible Technology* 23 (September 2025): 100124.
- Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- Rolnick, David, et al. "Tackling Climate Change with Machine Learning." *Nature Climate Change* 12 (2022): 1–9.
- Salatino, Adriana, Arthur Prevel, Emilie Caspar, and Salvatore Lo Bue. "Influence of AI Behavior on Human Moral Decisions, Agency, and Responsibility." *Scientific Reports* 15 (2025): 12329.
- Sen, Amartya. *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Stilgoe, Jack, Richard Owen, and Phil Macnaghten. "Developing a Framework for Responsible Innovation." *Research Policy* 42, no. 9 (2013): 1568–1580.
- Sutherland, Jeff. "On The Origin Of Scrum And AI," Retrieved January 6, 2025. <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/id/eprint/262954>
- Tang, Audrey. *Plurality: The Future of Collaborative Democracy*. MIT Civic Media Lecture Series, 2020.
- Topol, Eric. *Deep Medicine: How Artificial Intelligence Can Make Healthcare Human Again*. New York: Basic Books, 2019.
- UNESCO. *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. Paris: UNESCO, 2021.

- Wanyoike, M. “Moral Agency vs. Instrumental Agency: Defining the Boundaries.” *Medium*, 2025. <https://medium.com/@AIandInsights/agency-unbound-88f26335d186>.
- Zafar, Mandy. “Normativity and AI Moral Agency.” *AI and Ethics* 5, no. 3 (2025): 2605–2622.
- Zajko, Mike. “Artificial Intelligence, Algorithms, and Social Inequality: Sociological Contributions to Contemporary Debates.” *Sociology Compass* 16, no. 3 (2022): e12962.
- Zuboff, Shoshana. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2019.
- Buolamwini, Joy, and Timnit Gebru. “Gender Shades: Intersectional Accuracy Disparities in Commercial Gender Classification.” *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research* 81 (2018): 1–15.