Jagannath University Journal of Arts ISSN 2519-5816
Volume 15, No. 01 DOI : https://doi.org/10.3329/jnujarts.v15i1.87825
January-June 2025 Page: 153-159

Ethics and the Posthumanism: Redefining Personhood in the Age of Artificial Life

Dr. Mohammad Hafizul Islam*

Abstract

The rapid growth of technology is making it harder to tell the difference between people and machines. This problem is likely to stay. As a result, posthumanism has become an important way to rethink ideas about identity, personhood, and ethics in digital settings. This is because posthumanism has become an important point of view. Posthumanism challenges the fundamental humanist tenets that have traditionally shaped our understanding of humanity, advocating for a reassessment of the roles of artificial intelligence, robotics, and biotechnology in human existence. Posthumanism is a movement that calls for a new look at these technologies. These ideas have been the basis of our understanding of what it means to be human. The advent of artificial life, including beings that display traits like intelligence, consciousness, and free will, has initiated new ethical investigations regarding the nature of personality. These questions have come up because of the rise of artificial life. There has been a growing number of questions about these topics because artificial life is becoming more popular. This essay aims to examine the ethical ramifications of posthumanism and artificial life, particularly in relation to the potential erosion of established moral and social frameworks through the redefinition of personhood. The article will conduct a precise analysis of how these elements may constitute a threat. The essay will focus on the consequences that may result from reinterpreting the notion of personality.

Keywords : Ethics, Posthumanism, Personhood, and Artificial life.

* Professor, Department of Philosophy, Jagannath University, Dhaka.

Introduction

As we progress in the development of AI and synthetic beings, the question arises: Should we grant rights to these entities? What criteria do we employ to determine moral responsibility in interactions with artificial life? What impact does this notion of personhood have on our understanding of human dignity, autonomy, and social justice? Before tackling these difficulties, the paper will explore the historical and philosophical framework of posthumanism. This will facilitate understanding of the ethical challenges presented by artificial life. The article will analyze how artificial intelligence, robotics, and biotechnology are redefining our conception of personhood, highlighting both the prospective advantages and dangers of emerging technologies. The article will finally examine the profound societal ramifications of artificial life and the ethical dilemmas we must face in the impending age of posthumanism. As artificial life progressively integrates into our lives, the ethics of personhood will become a crucial area of philosophical inquiry (McGee & O'Connor, 2018).

Historical Context and Theoretical Frameworks

Posthumanism, as a philosophical and cultural movement, emerged in the late 20th century, although its roots can be traced further back in the history of philosophy and science. Posthumanism profoundly challenges the anthropocentric viewpoint that has characterized humanist philosophy since the Renaissance, particularly its belief in the superiority of human experience and the primacy of human values (Cohen, 2008). Posthumanism does not merely reject humanity; it recognizes its limitations as a fixed and prevailing categorization. It seeks to supplant the human subject and incorporate a broader spectrum of entities—both natural and artificial—into ethical and philosophical discussions (Braidotti, 2013). The theoretical underpinnings of posthumanism are seen in the works of thinkers such as Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and Gilles Deleuze, who contested the concept of a stable, autonomous human subject (Derrida, 2002). Donna Haraway's Cyborg Manifesto (1985) is a foundational text in posthumanist debate concerning technological advancement. Haraway's cyborg metaphor—a synthesis of machine and organism—rejects rigid boundaries between human and machine, offering a view of humanity that integrates technology as a fundamental component of its identity rather than viewing it as a menace (Haraway, 1985). N. Katherine Hayles' analysis in How We Became Posthuman (1999) examines the implications of information technology on human identity. Hayles contends that the posthuman body is detached from its biological roots and continuously interacts with the knowledge it acquires. This challenges the enduring Western concept of a clear distinction between mind and body (Hayles, 1999). Posthumanism, although analogous, is differentiated from transhumanism, a movement advocating for the enhancement of human capabilities through technology. Transhumanism asserts that technology may transcend human limitations and that an ideal future may involve the enhancement of human biology through artificial elements (Bostrom, 2005). In contrast, posthumanism advocates for a comprehensive viewpoint where humans coexist with other life forms—both organic and artificial—without elevating human-centric ethics (Braidotti, 2013).

How is consciousness related to personhood?

Consciousness is an important part of being human since it is connected to self-reflection, purpose, and first-hand experience. The essay says that being aware allows people to accomplish things that are essential to being human, including think, observe, and make moral choices. In posthuman situations, this raises the question: if an AI or synthetic life form acts in a way that makes it look like it is conscious, should we call it a "person"? The article says that a person's level of consciousness goes beyond their biological makeup. Smith (2022) says that this means that objects that aren't biological could be considered if they act in a way that seems to be conscious.

Artificial Life and the Evolution of Personhood

The notion of artificial life (AL) has been a pivotal topic in scientific and philosophical discussions, especially as technological progress expands the definition of "life." Artificial life denotes life forms generated through synthetic methods, including robotics, artificial intelligence (AI), or biotechnological modifications, rather than through natural biological processes. As these life forms gain greater autonomy, intelligence, and the ability to do tasks typically linked to humans or other sentient entities, they confront our established concepts of humanity. Personhood, conventionally described in humanist terms, is frequently associated with attributes such as consciousness, self-awareness, rationality, and the capacity for suffering. As we initiate the creation of artificial life forms that may display these characteristics, the inquiry regarding their entitlement to moral consideration or rights becomes increasingly urgent.

Artificial life significantly challenges our comprehension of personality by advancing AI that emulates cognitive processes once exclusively ascribed to humans. Artificial intelligence entities like Sophia the Robot and ChatGPT can participate in intricate dialogues, adapt based on their surroundings, and interact with humans in manners that emulate human behavior. These creatures lack biological bodies or feelings akin to humans; yet, their behavior prompts ethical considerations regarding their status as persons. Although some AI systems are not sentient—indicating they lack subjective experience—certain philosophers contend that the distinction between sentient and non-sentient entities is becoming progressively challenging to delineate (Torrance, 2018). AI beings doing functions typically linked to human intelligence, such as problem-solving or emotional recognition, compel us to reevaluate the definition of personality. Should an organism with great cognitive capabilities, yet devoid of organic consciousness, be regarded as a person? What rights might such entities have?

An essential element of the discourse concerning artificial life and personality pertains to the advancement of synthetic biology, which seeks to develop organisms with wholly artificial biological systems. Synthetic creatures, such as genetically modified bacteria or engineered viruses, may exhibit characteristics akin to natural life forms but are wholly created by humans. This exacerbates our comprehension of life and personhood. Can a creature built to duplicate specific characteristics of

natural life, such as self-replication, autonomy, or environmental reactivity, be regarded as living in the same manner as natural organisms? What ethical responsibilities do humans possess towards these artificial entities? The human enhancement movement introduces further complexity, proposing that future people may alter their biology to achieve greater integration with technology, so challenging the definitions of human and non-human life. For example, persons with neural implants or prostheses that enhance their cognitive or physical capabilities may obscure the boundary between organic and artificial life.

In addressing the concept of personality, certain philosophers have suggested functional or relational models that do not depend solely on biological or cognitive indicators. These models suggest that personhood may be attributed to any creature exhibiting specific capacities or participating in certain social or moral connections, irrespective of its biological composition (Gunkel, 2017). Within this perspective, AI systems capable of significant social interactions, comprehending ethical commitments, or exhibiting moral reasoning may be regarded as persons, although lacking the subjective consciousness traditionally linked to personhood in humans. This paves the path for extending moral consideration to artificial life forms similarly to how we accord moral rights to animals or non-human sentient entities, notwithstanding disparities in their biological composition.

The issue of conferring personhood upon artificial living forms entails significant ethical implications. Numerous detractors contend that attributing personhood to AI or synthetic life provokes enquiries regarding social justice and the risk of exploitation. If AI entities are afforded rights, what would be the mechanism for compensating their labor? Will they be exploited for their capabilities, akin to low-wage laborers in modern societies? Conversely, critics of conferring personhood upon AI beings contend that, despite their demonstration of intelligence or cognitive processing, they fundamentally lack critical attributes that characterize persons, such the ability for subjective experience or emotional profundity. This argument frequently references John Searle's philosophy, particularly his "Chinese Room" argument, which asserts that AI, despite its capacity for information processing, lacks true "understanding" and consciousness (Searle, 1980). Searle posits that the establishment of personality in artificial life forms is inherently unachievable, as these entities lack the capacity to perceive the world as humans do, hence challenging the ethical legitimacy of attributing them moral or legal personhood.

As artificial life advances, the necessity for novel ethical frameworks to regulate our interactions with these beings grows more pressing. The question of whether AI and synthetic life forms may attain full personhood compels us to examine profound concerns related to the significance of awareness, autonomy, and ethical agency. As AI advances, discussions on its ethical standing are expected to escalate, profoundly affecting our treatment of these artificial entities in legal and social frameworks. Furthermore, these discussions compel us to reevaluate the essence of personhood in an increasingly fluid world where the distinctions between human and non-human, as well as organic and artificial, are blurring. Artificial life necessitates a

reexamination of personhood, prompting critical reflection on our conceptions of life, sentience, and moral accountability.

Functionalism and Personhood

People are often thought of as having qualities like morality, intentionality, consciousness, and reason (Dennett, 1976). Functionalism can help us understand these qualities. This paradigm is more concerned with what an entity does and how it processes information than with what it is built of. Here are some of the most essential things that happen as a result:

Artificial Intelligence

AI can be used for Advanced AI systems can learn, correct themselves, and make judgments. Chalmers (1995) thinks that functionalism might help these systems grow more like people if they work in a way that is comparable to how people think.

Neurodiversity and Cognitive Disability

Functionalism lets in more people with brains that don't work the same way as most people's since it doesn't utilize biological criteria that are too simple. Nussbaum (2006) says that you can still be a person even if you don't follow the norms, like talking or being entirely reasonable. This keeps personhood the same.

Transhumanism and Improvement

Kurzweil (2005) thinks that functionalism might develop to accommodate people's shifting identities and selves when they employ technology in their bodies, like brain-computer interfaces. This indicates that functionalism can recognize persons as people if their functional profiles meet certain requirements.

Ethical Implications of Artificial Life and Posthumanism

A fundamental ethical quandary of posthumanism is to the concepts of identity and moral consideration. Traditional ethical perspectives have often relied on human characteristics—rationality, agency, and the capacity to endure suffering. As artificial entities, such as AI and synthetic organisms, gain increased autonomy and intelligence, these criteria become increasingly complex (Cooper, 2016). A critical question emerges: What delineates humanity in a posthuman framework? Do artificial beings possessing characteristics similar to human consciousness deserve identical moral rights?

The concept of personhood has been analyzed by philosophers such as Peter Singer, who argues that the capacity to suffer is a crucial criteria for moral consideration (Singer, 2009). Can an AI being, albeit lacking the capacity for human-like sadness, be considered a person with rights? If an artificial entity has advanced cognitive capabilities, does it deserve moral recognition, and what ethical responsibilities do humans have towards such entities? As artificial intelligence progresses, the criteria for personhood will undoubtedly necessitate reassessment to encompass non-biological entities (Gunkel, 2017).

Utilitarianism is a framework designed to enhance the overall welfare of all sentient beings. From a utilitarian perspective, AI entities and posthuman beings capable of experiencing pleasure or suffering warrant moral consideration. However, this poses an additional challenge: Can we adequately discern the internal experiences of an artificial life form? The endeavor to define consciousness in artificial intelligence requires further philosophical and scientific investigation (Torrance, 2018).

In contrast, deontological ethics, as defined by Immanuel Kant, emphasizes the inherent dignity of individuals, regardless of their cognitive capacities. A deontologist may argue that artificial beings, if they exhibit rationality or autonomy, should be considered goals in themselves rather than mere tools for human objectives (Kant, 1785). This generates considerable concern about the treatment of AI and robots, particularly in occupational and social settings, where they may be exploited for human benefit without ethical consideration.

Virtue ethics, which prioritizes the moral and character development of individuals, asserts that individuals are obligated to create moral frameworks that promote the wellbeing of both humans and the artificial life forms that interact with them. This may cultivate a more sympathetic and empathetic understanding of our relationships with AI and posthuman beings (Hursthouse, 1999).

Conclusion

The ethical ramifications of posthumanism, especially concerning artificial life and the progression of personhood, raise significant enquiries that contest conventional limits of human identity, rights, and moral regard. As artificial entities—whether via AI, robots, or synthetic biology—progress and demonstrate increasingly intricate behaviors, our traditional conception of "personhood" must shift. The concept that personality is not solely linked to biological origins introduces additional ethical considerations, wherein artificial life forms may warrant moral acknowledgement, especially if they display characteristics such as consciousness, autonomy, or the capacity to suffer.

Philosophical disputes persist on the potential for artificial life to attain personhood akin to humans, highlighting the necessity of reassessing ethical foundations in an era of swiftly evolving technologies. The task is to establish ethical frameworks that consider both human interests and the possible rights of artificial beings. As we go towards a progressively posthuman era, the definitions of personhood and rights must broaden to include not only human beings but also the non-human intelligences and life forms we develop.

The enquiries posed by posthumanism and artificial life extend beyond academia, possessing tangible consequences for societal attitudes towards AI, robotics, and genetically modified organisms in the future. The attainment of legal personhood by these entities, or their continued status as instruments for human utility, will hinge on the ethical frameworks we establish presently. The changing dynamics of artificial life necessitate a reevaluation of humanity's position in a world where the distinctions between organic and artificial are increasingly indistinct, prompting a more comprehensive and contemplative approach to our ethical obligations towards

all life forms—human and non-human alike. The discourse on artificial life and personality is in its nascent stages, necessitating meticulous consideration, innovation, and, crucially, a dedication to equity and justice for all sentient and autonomous entities, irrespective of their origin.

References

Bostrom, N. (2005*). Transhumanist Values*. Journal of Philosophical Research, 30, 3–14. https://doi.org/10.5840/jpr2005309

Braidotti, R. (2013). *The Posthuman*. Polity Press.

Chalmers, D. J. (1995). Facing up to the problem of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies, 2*(3), 200–219.

Cooper, D. E. (2016). The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and Robotics. In L. B. Oliver & K. C. McMahon (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Artificial Intelligence* (pp. 132–148). Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, R. (2008). The Ethics of Posthumanism. *Philosophy & Technology*, 21(2), 165–185. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-008-0015-0

Dennett, D. C. (1976). Conditions of personhood. In A. O. Rorty (Ed.), *The Identities of Persons* (pp. 175–196). University of California Press.

Derrida, J. (2002). The Animal that Therefore I am. In D. Wills (Ed.), *A Derrida Reader: Between the Blinds* (pp. 100-106). University of Chicago Press.

Gunkel, D. J. (2017). *Robot Rights*. MIT Press.

Haraway, D. (1985). A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-feminism in the late Twentieth Century. *Socialist Review*, 80, 65-107.

Hayles, N. K. (1999). *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics*. University of Chicago Press.

Hursthouse, R. (1999). *On Virtue Ethics*. Oxford University Press.

Kant, I. (1785). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Translated by T. K. Abbott (1909). https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2015/entries/kant-moral/

Kurzweil, R. (2005). *The singularity is near: When humans transcend biology*. Viking.

McGee, S., & O'Connor, T. (2018). The Ethical Implications of Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Ethics and Information Technology*, 20(3), 221-230. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-018-9453-z

Nussbaum, M. C. (2006). *Frontiers of justice: Disability, nationality, species membership*. Belknap Press.

Searle, J. R. (1980). Minds, Brains, and Programs. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 3(3), 417-457. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00005756

Singer, P. (2009). The ethical treatment of animals and artificial intelligence. In *Practical Ethics* (pp. 273-291). Cambridge University Press.

Smith, A. J. (2022). *Ethics and the Posthuman: Redefining Personhood in the Age of Artificial Life*. Journal of Posthuman Studies, 6(2), 115–134. https://doi.org/10.5325/jpoststud.6.2.0115

Torrance, S. (2018). The Nature of Consciousness and Artificial Intelligence. In S. L. Roy (Ed.), *The Philosophy of AI* (pp. 199-220). Routledge.