

## Do we care? An Exploratory Review of Moral Sentiments upon Artificial Intelligence

Gisele Simoes<sup>1</sup>, James B. Johnston<sup>1</sup>, Kevin Reuther<sup>1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of the West of Scotland, PA1 2BE Paisley, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup> University of Applied Sciences Zwickau, Kornmarkt 1, 08056 Zwickau, Germany

<sup>3</sup> University of Leipzig, Augustusplatz 10, 04109 Leipzig, Germany

The ability for caring is the ability for maintaining, continuing, and repairing the world we live in, a world of life-sustaining web that includes our bodies, ourselves and the environment (Swartz et al, 2018). From the perspective of ancient philosophers, Aristotle considered that care is one of the main qualities of human action that bestows value of life (Laurenz, 2021). Furthermore, Seneca reflected that human reason exists to permit us to achieve the good and only through care is possible to refine the good (Ciulla, 2009). The ancients and industrialised western diverged about the nature and orientation of care. The mechanised production of industrial revolution stimulated new studies regarding economic, social and political forces from a scientific perspective (Buchanan & Hucznski, 2019; Mazzucato, 2018). Descartes, Smith and other philosophers at the time offered an objective view of ethics based on absolutist moral principles of rights and wrongs, and putting the individual in the center of his interests (Crane et al, 2019; Burnes, 2019). This period of enlightenment led to a separation of mind and body, proposed by Descartes with his famed "*Cogito ergo sum. (I think, therefore I am.)*". This approach stimulated the separation of personal and professional lives, and the rise of two main ethical theories, duty ethics and utilitarianism (Johnson and Curton, 2016; Smith, 2018). In the theory of moral sentiments, considered his most relevant work by himself, Adam Smith (1759) discusses the levels of care of the individual, starting:

*After himself, the members of his family, those who usually live in the same house with him, his parents, his children, his brothers and sisters, are naturally the objects of his warmest affections. (p. 258)*

Smith (1759) further adverts the affection is developed by domestic education, by the convivial necessity to be kind with relatives. This connection can be lost in commercial countries, where the law covers the necessity of protection, but could be developed between individuals from different families, such as colleagues and partners in trade.

Care is not free of criticisms, being defined by Nietzsche as a naive subservient trait, carried by unpowered people. This objective perspective of ethics gained force in America during the cold war, when the contrast between individualism and collectivism was accentuated (Crane et al., 2019). Ayn Rand and Milton Friedman were important thinkers of ethical egoism, which states each one is responsible for their own happiness and success. In this post-industrial society, so called information society, this approach led to explosive technological changes, by the introduction of computers and communication technologies (Webster, 2006; Hughes, 2016; Smith, 2018;). In this context, Artificial Intelligence raised again in public interest, converging discussions about innovation, ethics and social good (Dauvergne, 2020). Currently, AI has many definitions and wrong perceptions (Heikkinen, 2019; Sarmah, 2019). Assertively, Tadeo and Floridis (2018) said AI is:

*a growing resource of interactive, autonomous, self-learning agency, which enables computational artifacts to perform tasks that otherwise would require human intelligence to be executed successfully. (p. 751)*

This new Age of AI is described by Iansiti and Lakhani (2020) as a dramatic transformational force that is going to change various disciplines and activities, requiring in its scalability new approaches for regulations and ethics. Dauvergne (2020) indicates the areas of ethical dilemmas related with AI are extensive, including bias and discrimination, social inequities and injustices. The question should be made now is “do we care?”. In 2011, Spitzbeck suggested corporations would not change their behaviour based only on moral reasons due to infeasibility. Nevertheless, “most companies are starting to pay attention” (p.54).

New contemporary approaches of ethics emerged, driven by integrity, relationship, empathy and moral impulse, exploring the subjective perspective of rights and wrongs. Ethics of care is from a branch of feminism, indicating the women’s ability for care as a human strength, an approach that should be followed by women and men (Crane et al., 2019; Gutenberg, n.a.). Stechley and Smith (2011) argue ethics of care offers an increasingly relevant alternative to

the rational approaches, through a dynamic process that engages with life situations and people. Also, they indicate there is a difference between 'care about' and 'care for'. The first approach is theoretically consistent, but does not provide direct care, so, inefficient in practice. In contrast, the second approach is the face-to-face engaging practice, where appropriate relationships are built, moderating intimacy and boundaries. Hamington and Sanderstaudt (2011) state care ethics provides a guide for business in a globalised market, exploring the relations of dependency and vulnerability.

Developed countries and international organisations are committed to demonstrate they care about AI Ethics. New regulations to control the impact of AI in society are being discussed around the world, indicating new frameworks and more attention to decision-making problems and high risky areas. (Cath et al., 2017; COMEST, 2019; Gov.nz, 2020; Gov.uk, 2021; European Commission, 2021). However, those discussions are rationalist in essence and are not covering the social and emotional impact of automation in the long-term. The inequalities and discrimination have been identified, but again without extensive discussion about what that means for society from a holistic view. What kind of society, conducted by artificial intelligence, we will have, in case we do not give humanity enough interaction and autonomy? Besides the risk of paternalism and parochialism (Swartz et al., 2018), ethics of care demonstrates a good potential to contribute to AI Ethics in postmodern societies. Understanding the complexity of those societies, a humanistic view would be necessary to safeguard humanity from their own rationalism and short-term views. Empathy is an essential tool to practice care; in an AI environment, the risk of excessive independence should be taken seriously, as it was demonstrated to affect our 'caring for', hence, our moral obligation. Regarding whom we should care about in an AI context, it should consider the dependencies and vulnerabilities of all human beings. Overall, ethics of care does not replace all normative ethics theories, but it could be an essential tool to guarantee a pluralistic analysis of rights and wrongs, mostly useful where outcomes cannot or should not be rationally predicted.

## References:

- Buchanan, D.A. and Huczynski, A.A. (2019) Organizational behaviour, 10th ed. Harlow: Pearson UK.
- Burnes, B. (2017) Managing change: A strategic approach to organisational dynamics, 7th. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Cath, C., Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., Taddeo, M. and Floridi, L. (2017) Artificial Intelligence and the 'Good Society': the US, EU, and UK approach, *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 24, pp. 505–528.
- Ciulla, J.B. (2009) Leadership and the ethics of care. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(1), pp.3-4.
- COMEST (2019) Preliminary Study On The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. Available at: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000367823> (Accessed: 14 July 2020)
- Crane, A., Matten, D., Glozer, S. and Spence, L. (2019) Business ethics: Managing corporate citizenship and sustainability in the age of globalization. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Dauvergne, P. (2020) AI in the Wild: Sustainability in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. London: MIT Press.
- European Commission (2021). Europe fit for the Digital Age: Commission proposes new rules and actions for excellence and trust in Artificial Intelligence. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip\\_21\\_1682](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_21_1682) (Accessed: 22 May 2021)
- Govt.nz (2020) Submissions Summary: draft Algorithm Charter. Available at: <https://data.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Algorithms/Draft-Algorithm-Charter-Summary-of-Submissions-February-2020.pdf> (Accessed: 22 May 2021)
- Gov.uk (2021) Ethics, Transparency and Accountability Framework for Automated Decision - Making. Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ethics-transparency-and-accountability-framework-for-automated-decision-making/ethics-transparency-and-accountability-framework-for-automated-decision-making?utm\\_campaign=BCS%20Membership&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_source=hs\\_email&utm\\_content=128148621](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ethics-transparency-and-accountability-framework-for-automated-decision-making/ethics-transparency-and-accountability-framework-for-automated-decision-making?utm_campaign=BCS%20Membership&utm_medium=email&utm_source=hs_email&utm_content=128148621) (Accessed: 19 May 2021)
- Gutenberg (n.a.) Ethics of Care. Available at: [http://www.gutenberg.cc/articles/eng/Ethics\\_of\\_care](http://www.gutenberg.cc/articles/eng/Ethics_of_care) (Accessed: 04 June 2021)
- Hamington, M. and Sander-Staudt, M. eds. (2011) Applying care ethics to business. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Heikkinen, T.H. (2019) How does the use of artificial intelligence affect the concept of fair trial?. Masters level. Lund University.

- Hughes, B. (2016) *The bleeding edge: Why technology turns toxic in an unequal world*. Oxford: New Internationalist.
- Iansiti, M. and Lakhani, K.R. (2020) *Competing in the age of AI: strategy and leadership when algorithms and networks run the world*. Harvard Business Press.
- Johnson, R. and Curton, A. (2016) Kant's Moral Philosophy. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Available at: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-moral/> (Accessed: 18 May 2021)
- Laurenz, J. (2021) Confucius, Aristotle, and the Golden Mean: A Diptych on Ethical Virtues, *The European Legacy*, 26(2), pp. 149-169.
- Mazzucato, M. (2018) *The value of everything: Making and taking in the global economy*. Hachette UK.
- Sarmah, S.S. (2019) Concept of Artificial Intelligence, its Impact and Emerging Trends, *IRJET*, 6(11), pp. 2164-2168.
- Smith, A. (1759) *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Indianapolis, Indiana: Liberty Classics.
- Smith, M. (2018) *Ethics for Scottish social work. Social Work in a Changing Scotland*. Routledge.
- Steckley, L. and Smith, M. (2011) Care ethics in residential child care: A different voice. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 5(2), pp.181-195.
- Swartz, B.C., Gachago, D. and Belford, C. (2018) To care or not to care—reflections on the ethics of blended learning in times of disruption. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 32(6), pp.49-64.
- Spitzeck, H. (2011) An integrated model of humanistic management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 99(1), pp.51-62.
- Taddeo, M. and Floridi, L. (2018) How AI can be a force for good, *Science*, 361(6404), pp.751-752.
- Webster, F. (2006) *Theories of The Information Society*, 3rd edn. Oxon: Routledge.