



e-ISSN: 2319-8753 | p-ISSN: 2347-6710

IJIRSET

International Journal of Innovative Research in
SCIENCE | ENGINEERING | TECHNOLOGY



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH

IN SCIENCE | ENGINEERING | TECHNOLOGY

Volume 14, Special Issue 6, December 2025

ISSN INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA

Impact Factor: 8.699



9940 572 462



6381 907 438



ijirset@gmail.com



www.ijirset.com

A Study on Technological Ethics AI and Human Dignity

Dr. VSD Himabindu¹, Dr. M. Nagavalli², Dr. Madhuri Sailaja³, Ms. Neeraja Ganivada⁴

Assistant Professor, Department of Basic Sciences & HSS, Andhra University College of Engineering for Women,
Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India¹

Assistant Professor, Department of Basic Sciences & HSS, Andhra University College of Engineering for Women,
Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India²

Assistant Professor, Department of Physics, BS&HSS, AUCEW, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam,
Andhra Pradesh, India³

UG, Department of Information Technology and Computer Applications Engineering, Andhra University College of
Engineering for Women, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India⁴

ABSTRACT: The rapid development of artificial intelligence and digital technologies reforms the modern society, influences economic systems, health care, education, government and human interaction the intersection of technology, artificial intelligence and human dignity by assessing both potential benefits and risks. There is a need for responsible innovation through ethical structures and cases. The findings that emphasize the future of technology should be guided by principles that prioritize respect for human dignity, justice and social confidence. If the realist AI functions ideally like a moral microscope, an anti-realist AI functions like an automated food critic. It issues sophisticated expert opinions, which are ultimately matters of individual taste. Depending on the version of anti-realism involved, this AI could even contradict itself. Whoever uses it may therefore get the impression that right and wrong are also matters of taste. This creates a risk of the moral AI being an example of moral judgments being arbitrary opinions that are verified by our intuitions. In order to avoid this, special care would have to be taken to ensure that the average user of them AI is sophisticated enough to distinguish anti-realism from arbitrariness. Programming an AI with anti-realist assumptions in mind generates further problems that do not affect realist AI: an existential problem and a practical problem. The existential problem has to do with the added value of creating an AI that can serve as a moral adviser or decision aid, given the assumption that moral facts and properties are merely reflections of human mental states and that what constitutes a judgment about right or wrong, good or bad may be subjective. In other words, it is not clear why we should build an anti-realist moral AI at all. The practical problem is best stated as a conditional: if we think the anti-realist AI can add value, engineers will have to imbue the AI with some foundational moral values in a non-arbitrary way. This latter possibility is likely to reify the moral values accepted in the place and time of the AI's creation or the personal idiosyncrasies of its designers.

Neither possibility is likely to result in a situation where the AI morally advises anyone; it merely convinces people to moral positions they already hold. The practical problem generates a risk that can be attributed to the development of many, if not all, new technologies, namely, reifying norms that are not desirable. Technology inevitably mediates values but it can also change them, reify the value reflected in the technology. For example, wheelchair ramps on government buildings embody the value of egalitarian access to civic life (reflecting our values). Dating apps like Tinder encourage short-term relationships, even when its users may be looking for long-term relationships (changing values).

KEYWORDS: digital technologies, social confidence, economics systems, artificial intelligence (AI)

I. INTRODUCTION

AI Driven by technology - the 21st century is defined for rapid technological advancement. This includes AI and automation that determines how we live, work and interact. Technology Helps in economic growth, efficiency and global connectivity.

Human Dignity:

Rooted with recognition of autonomous right and internal value to privacy and respect forms the cornerstone of human right discussion. As the technology is integrated into decision -making processes as a deep governance & security Human-written text: Scientists, decision-makers and technology experts should work together to make sure that progress goes hand in hand with development of technology keeping human values in mind. centered on the subjects of human dignity and technology ethics It is an honor to welcome everyone to the seminar today on Technology Ethics and Human Dignity, a subject at the core of our quickly changing digital world. We are faced with important questions as we stand at the nexus of amazing technological advancement and significant societal change: How can we make sure that technology advances humanity rather than detracts from it? How do we safeguard the fundamental principles that make us human—

- 1.our freedom
- 2.privacy
- 3.autonomy
- 4.most importantly, our dignity

In a world of genetic engineering, automation, artificial intelligence, and surveillance systems? Technology is influenced by the goals behind its development and the principles

Objective:**1. The brief explanation and the meaning of ethics**

- Ethics is a complex concept. It can be defined as the moral principles that guide the behaviors or actions of individuals or groups (Nalini, 2019).
- In simpler terms, ethics consists of rules or guidelines that help us determine what is good or right. Generally, ethics deals with the distinction between right and wrong, along with the moral obligations and duties of various entities, such as humans and intelligent robots.
- Many researchers from different fields have studied ethics. Most people learn about virtue ethics early in life. Parents and teachers often instill these values to help children behave well.
- Aristotle (Yu, 1998) argues that when someone acts in line with virtue, that person will thrive and find contentment. Virtue ethics is a part of normative ethics, which looks at what makes actions right or wrong. It provides guiding principles that help people navigate tough moral choices.
- As the interactions among humans, between humans and animals, between humans and machines, and even among machines increase, ethical theories are applied in various real-life situations, including business ethics, animal ethics, and military ethics.
- In the context of AI, the ethics of AI specifies the moral obligations and duties of an AI and its creators. Researchers have done much work studying human ethical issues. Many ethical frameworks can be used to direct human behaviours such as actions and activities related to respect for individuals.

2. human dignity guide and the use of technology

- In the 18th century, Immanuel Kant popularized the concept of dignity as an illegal norm, grounded in the belief that “To treat people with dignity is to treat them as autonomous individuals able to choose their destiny”.
- The idea of human dignity has an undoubted legal presence. It has, famously, a prominent place in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, wherein the Preamble refers to "the inherent dignity and the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family", and Article 1 asserts that "all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights".
- Similarly, Article 1 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights declares that "Human dignity is inviolable. It must be respected and protected." Dignity has also been described as "the very essence" of the European Convention on Human Rights. Human dignity is the recognition that human beings possess a special value intrinsic to their humanity and such a worthy of respect simply because they are human beings
- The idea has been referenced again and again by courts in a host of recent cases spanning a range of different areas of law: the dignity of same-sex couples, patients, prisoners, detainees, asylum seekers, women seeking abortions, and people wishing to end their lives.
- Over twenty years ago, one legal observer noted that "human dignity is not an abstract metaphysical notion, it is an established and orthodox legal concept.

3. the relation between artificial intelligence and human dignity

- Artificial intelligence is a technology that can both support and threaten people.

Potential Threats to Human Dignity:

- Privacy violations - Privacy and surveillance
- Job displacement
- Discrimination and Bias
- The humanising interaction
- Autonomous Weapons
- Today, AI-powered software is used to identify terrorist threats and targets in voice, image, email, social media, and SMS data; to assign criminal defendants risk scores for judges to use in making bail, sentencing, and parole decisions; to tell your local law enforcement where they are most likely to encounter certain crimes; and to diagnose cancers and recommend personalized treatment plans.
- Task-specific AI algorithms are calculating how likely you are to "fit" into the corporate culture or remain with the company to which you have applied, how close a "match" a stranger is to your romantic preferences, how likely you are to repay the loan you applied for, or the chances that your kid will thrive at the selective private school you want her to attend. These decisions govern how well or how poorly our lives go: whether we live or die, whether we work or are unemployed, whether we are free or unfree.
- What would it take for you to trust a machine to make such life-changing decisions for you-or for your employer, loan officer, doc-tor, insurance company, or your child's college admissions committee? In many cases, it's already happening.
- There is a common saying that commands prudence in matters of social reliance: "trust, but verify." Consider this: In virtually none of these artificial decision support systems can you, as an ordinary person affected by the outcome, know how the algorithmic decision process is carried out, or what salient factors drove the algorithm's result in your particular case. In many cases-due to the lack of trans-parency in "deep learning" algorithms that work without showing their internal logic-even the system's program-mers and administrators lack a clear view of how or why the system reached its conclusion. So who, what, and how do we verify? And if we cannot verify, can we still trust?
- One might think that careful regimes of inspection can easily ensure that artificial agents are operating properly, and that what's "under the hood" is not broken or poorly designed. Yet what's under the hood in many such systems is not a set of clear, stable rules and inferences that we can examine and test for their validity, but rather a tangled mess of artificial neural networks arranged in complex lay-ers with nodes and weightings that constantly rearrange

Ways to protect human dignity in AI Era:

1. Use of Ethical Frameworks
2. Implementing Human Centre Design
3. Ensuring Preservation of Autonomy
4. Addressing Social Justice
5. Focus on Intrinsic Value

II. METHODOLOGY (SECONDARY DATA)

The identification performance drops dramatically when outdoor images are used in spite of the fact that they can be judged as relatively good as indicated above. One would not expect a typical video camera to get this quality of image all the time. For the best systems the recognition rate for faces captured outdoors (i.e. less than ideal circumstances) was only 50% at a false accept rate of 1%. Thus, as the report concluded: "face recognition from outdoor imagery remains a research challenge area." The main reason for this problem is that the algorithm cannot distinguish between the change in tone pixel level, caused by a relatively dark shadow, versus such a change caused by a facial feature. As such it starts to code shadows as facial features. The impact of this on the identification may be severe if it happens to be in certain key areas of the face.

As one would expect, the identification performance also decreases as time laps increases between the acquisition of the database image and the newly captured probe image presented to a system. FRVT 2002 found that for the top systems, performance degraded at approximately 5% points per year. It is not unusual of the security establishment to have a relatively old photograph of a suspect. Thus, a two year old photograph will take 10% off the identification performance. A study by the US National Institute of Standards and Technology found that two sets of mugshots taken 18 months apart

produced a recognition rate of only 57% (Brooks 2002). Gross et al. (2001: 17) found an even more dramatic deterioration. In their evaluation, the performance dropped by 20% in recognition rate for images just two weeks apart. Obviously these evaluations are not directly comparable. Nevertheless, there is a clear indication that there may be a significant deterioration when there is a time gap between the database image and the probe image. For the best system, "the top-rank identification rate was 85% on a database of 800 people, 83% on a database of 1,600, and 73% on a database of 37,437. For every doubling of database size, performance decreases by two to three overall percentage points" (Phillips et al. 2003: 21). What would this mean for extremely large databases? For example, the UK fingerprint database consists of approximately 5.5 million records. If one had a similar size 'mugshot database how will the algorithms perform in identifying a probe image in that database? If one takes the decrease to be 2.5% for every doubling of the database, and use 73% at 37,437 as the baseline, then one would expect the identification performance to be approximately 55% in ideal conditions and as low as 32% in less than ideal conditions.

To conclude this discussion we can imagine a very plausible scenario where we have a large database, less than ideal image due to factors such as variable illumination, outdoor conditions, poor camera angle, etc. and the probe image is relatively old, a year or two. Under these conditions the probability to be recognized is very low, unless one sets the false accept rate to a much higher level, which means that there is a risk that a high number of individuals may be subjected to scrutiny for the sake of a few potential identifications. What will be the implications of this for practice? We will take up this point again below.

Obviously, we do not know how these factors would affect us. act together and they are not necessarily cumulative.

III. CONCLUSION

Many arguments against euthanasia and assisted suicide have been based upon considerations of the social consequences. Many of the counterarguments have been attempts to show that safeguards can be constructed to place wedges along the "slippery slope. This paper has presented arguments about why euthanasia and assisted suicide are intrinsically immoral acts. Euthanasia and assisted suicide are immoral because these actions directly attack the bedrock human value which makes all other human values possible the inherent dignity of human life.

The demand for euthanasia and assisted suicide is, in some ways, an ironic demand for a quick technological solution to the problems technology itself has created.

Autonomous vehicles hold the promise to reduce the very significant damage that human driving currently causes with approximately 1 million humans being killed per year, many more injured, the environment polluted, soil sealed with tarmac, cities full of parked cars, etc. etc. However, there seem to be questions on how autonomous vehicles should behave, and how responsibility and risk should be distributed in the complicated system the vehicles operate in. There is some discussion of 'trolley problems in this context. In the classic 'trolley problems (Woollard & Howard-Snyder 2016, section 2) various dilemmas are presented: The simplest version is that of a trolley train on a track that is heading towards five people and will kill them, unless the train is diverted onto a side track, but on that track there is one person, who will be killed if the train takes that side track. "Trolley problems are not supposed to describe actual ethical problems or to be solved with a 'right' choice. Rather, they are thought-experiments where choice is artificially constrained to a small finite number of distinct one-off options and where the agent has perfect knowledge. These thought-experiments are used as a theoretical tool to investigate ethical intuitions and theories- especially the difference between actively doing vs. allowing something to happen. intended vs. tolerated consequences, and consequentialist vs. other normative approaches. This type of problem has reminded many of the problems encountered in actual driving, and in autonomous driving. It is doubtful, however, that an actual driver or autonomous car will ever have to solve trolley problems. While autonomous car trolley problems have received a lot of media attention, they do not seem to offer anything new to either ethical theory or to the programming of autonomous vehicles

REFERENCES

1. Stone, C. D. (1972). Should trees have standing Toward legal rights for natural objects? Southern California Law Review (2), 450-501.
2. Strawson, G. (2004, 29.02.2004). Free will. Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved May 2005, 2005, from <http://www.rep.routledge.com/article/V014>

3. Susser, D., Roessler, B., & Nissenbaum, H. (2019). Technology, autonomy, and manipulation. *Internet Policy Review*
4. Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2018). *How AI can be a force for good Science*
5. van Wynsberghe, A. (2016). *Healthcare robots: Ethics, design and implementation*. London: Routledge.
6. Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B. D., & Russell, C. (2018). Counterfactual explanations without opening the black box: Automated decisions and the GDPR. *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology*, 31 (2).
7. Wallach, W., & Asaro, P. M. (Eds.). (2017). *Machine Ethics and Robot Ethics*. London: Routledge.
8. Whittaker, M., Crawford, K., Dobbe, R., Fried, G., Kaziunas, E., Mathur, V., Schultz, J. (2018). *AI Now Report* [https://ainowinstitute.org/AI Now 2018 Report.html](https://ainowinstitute.org/AI_Now_2018_Report.html) 2018. from
9. Woollard, F., & Howard-Snyder, F. (2016). Doing vs. allowing harm. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
10. Woolley, S., & Howard, P. (Eds.). (2017). *Computational propaganda: Political parties, politicians, and political manipulation on social media*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
11. Yeung, K., & Lodge, M. (Eds.). (2019). *Algorithmic regulation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
12. Zerilli, J., Knott, A., Maclaurin, J., & Gavaghan, C. (2019). Transparency in algorithmic and human decision-making: Is there a double standard? *Philosophy & Technology*
13. Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. New York: Public Affairs.
14. Action on Elder Abuse (2004) *Hidden Voices: Older people's Experience of Abuse*, Published by Help the Aged.
15. Banks, M. R., Willoughby, L. M., & Banks, W. A. (2008). Animal assisted therapy and loneliness in nursing homes: Use of robotic versus living dogs. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*, 9(3)
16. Borenstein, J., & Pearson, Y. (2010). Robot caregivers: Harbingers of expanded freedom for all
17. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 12(3), 277-288 article
18. Bostrom, N. (2008) Dignity and Enhancement. In *Human Dignity and Bioethics: Essays commissioned by the President's council on Bioethics* (Washington, DC) 173-207
19. Cayton, H. (2006) From childhood to childhood? Autonomy and dependence through the ages of life. In Julian C. Hughes, Stephen J. Louw, Steven R. Sabat (Eds) *Dementia: mind, meaning, and the person*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press 277-286
20. Coeckelbergh, M. (2010). Health care, capabilities, and AI assistive technologies. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 13(2), 181-190.
21. Coeckelbergh, M. (2012) "How I learned to Love the Robot": Capabilities, Information Technologies, and Elderly Care' in: Oosterlaken, I. and van den Hoven, J (eds.) *The Capability Approach, Technology and Design*. Dordrecht: Springer (ISBN 9789400738782)
22. Fratiglioni L, Wang H-X, Ericsson K, et al. (2000) Influence of social network on occurrence of dementia: a community-based longitudinal study. *Lancet*
23. Glover, J. (1999). *Humanity: a moral history of the twentieth century*. London, J. Cape.
24. Haney, C., Banks, W.C. & Zimbardo, P.G. (1973) A study of prisoners and guards in a simulated prison. *Naval Research Review*
25. Kanamori, M., Suzuki, M., & Tanaka, M., (2002) Maintenance and improvement of quality of life among elderly patients using a pet-type robot. *Japanese Journal of Geriatrics*
26. Macklin, R. (2003) Dignity is a Useless Concept. *British Medical Journal*
27. Mordoch, E., Osterreicher, A., Guse, L., Roger, K., Thompson, G. (2013) Use of social commitment



INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH

IN SCIENCE | ENGINEERING | TECHNOLOGY

 9940 572 462  6381 907 438  ijirset@gmail.com



www.ijirset.com

Scan to save the contact details