

HUMAN-AI INTERACTION, GYNIST PHILOSOPHY AND THE FUTURE OF HUMAN AGENCY

Marie Pauline Eboh & Nmesoma Michael Okeke

Philosophy Department, Faculty of Humanities
Rivers State University, Port Harcourt

Abstract

The rise of AI agents in the form of predictive algorithms, autonomous decision-making systems, and epistemic authorities that dictate truth and knowledge makes human-AI interaction imperative. However, it signals an erosion of human autonomy, a displacement of ethical responsibility, and an unsettling shift in governance structures. Thus, the problem is fundamentally philosophical. Humanity needs a moral framework to reclaim agency and ensure that AI remains a tool rather than a master. Many have resigned to the inevitability of AI dominance; they believe that human reason has been technologically usurped. But the phrase “the future of human agency” tends to raise reformative hope. This paper employs a critical approach to interrogate AI’s unchecked epistemic power. Gynist philosophy, an African gender theory advocating inclusivity, dialogue, accommodationist love, ethical integration, and mutual complementarity, will be used to proffer an AI governance model that safeguards human dignity, autonomy, and responsibility.

Keywords: Human-AI interaction, Human Agency, Artificial Intelligence, AI Agent, Gynist Philosophy, Ethical AI.

Introduction

Human interaction has been profoundly reshaped by technology. Artificial Intelligence (AI) now drives conversations, assists in decision-making, and influences creativity. Tasks are increasingly automated, and human reliance on AI continues to grow. However, critical concerns about human agency, ethics, and identity have been raised. If AI systems think, analyze, and act, the place of human reason must be reconsidered. The question of control arises: have humans ceded authority to algorithms? These concerns are not mere speculations; they define governance, labour, and truth in the modern world. Could this be a fulfillment of Nietzsche's *Übermensch* prophetic proposal of a time when people would develop into a better version of themselves (superman) as to dictate their values? Could AI be emblematic of Nietzsche's proposed superman, and has humanity transcended to superhumanity? Perhaps, humanity has come to the said transcendence amid AI advancements today. Humans are often heedless of advice. They failed to see the imprints on the wall. Had they but heeded the advice of concerned ethicists, humanity would not have been lured with ease into this unprecedented joint but lopsided relationship between AI and humans. As Bostrom warned, AI's advancement could

surpass human intelligence, altering civilization itself.⁷¹ The challenge does not hinge on AI's existence but on its integration. Who will blame Sweden for kicking AI out of their classrooms? In the West, AI has been harnessed to enhance efficiency in practically all fields of human endeavour. In Africa, however, technological dependency has been deepened by imported AI models that fail to reflect local realities. Rodney contended that development is not driven by technology alone but by control over it.⁷² AI tends to represent a new form of power, and humanity risks being positioned as a passive recipient.

Beyond socio-economic concerns, ethical dilemmas have also emerged. AI reshapes ethics; the rise of AI-generated decisions raises questions about accountability. AI algorithms now determine employment opportunities and other aspects of human life. When biases are embedded in these

⁷¹Miles Brundage, "Taking Superintelligence Seriously: *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies* by Nick Bostrom," *Futures* 72 (2015): 32–35, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2015.07.009>.

⁷² Gabriel O. Apata, "Review: Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*," *Theory, Culture & Society*, September 29, 2018, <https://www.theoryculturesociety.org/blog/review-walter-rodney-how-europe-underdeveloped-africa#:~:text=The%20logic%20of%20development%2C%20for,wholly%20beneficial%20to%20one%20side>

systems, discrimination becomes automated. If unregulated, AI will reinforce existing inequalities. It is now clear why Kant maintained that morality demands treating humans as ends rather than means. This is to say that sometimes morality requires a touch of rigidity; for without ethical oversight, AI could reduce individuals to mere data points. Seemingly, the rise of AI has equally challenged the idea of human identity. Heidegger averred that technology is not neutral but actively shapes perception.⁷³ If machines assume the roles of teachers, caregivers, and decision-makers, the essence of humanity risks being eroded. The Igbo sororal philosophy of *onye aghala nwanne ya* - *no one should be left behind* contradicts AI's impersonal efficiency. Humans have ceased becoming their brother's keeper; hence, they invent systems that threaten the very fabric of human society. The challenge presented by AI is not only technological but existential. Thus, humans must constructively tackle the problem they themselves created or run the risk of entering Max Weber's "iron cage". That is, if we are not there already.

Despite these concerns, resistance to AI's advancement is neither practical nor wise. Since it is

⁷³ University of Twente, *The Technological View of the World of Martin Heidegger*, FutureLearn, accessed March 12, 2025, <https://www.futurelearn.com/info/courses/philosophy-of-technology/0/steps/26314>.

unwise to reject AI in toto, humans have to restate the human-AI relationship for adequate representation. The future of human-AI interaction should depend on ethical symbiosis, a relationship defined by accommodationist love, dialogue, respect, and complementarity. The imports of feminist philosophy must be embraced to ensure that AI enhances, rather than diminishes, human agency. Since AI's progress cannot be undone, collaboration is the rational path forward. But "Can two walk together unless they are agreed?"(Amos 3:3). Humanity must acknowledge AI's unprecedented advancements and prepare for a future shaped by them (humans). Did the Igbo not say: *Mberede nyiri dike mana mberede ka eji ama dike* - *unexpected challenges overwhelm the brave, but the brave seize the opportunity to prove their mettle*. This adage applies to the future of human-AI interactions. The rise of AI is a test of human adaptability, not a sign of defeat.

A future where AI and humans will co-exist not as rivals but as partners in progress is envisioned. This study critiques AI's unchecked authority and argues for a balanced approach where AI remains a tool with its agency that respects human dignity. Through the lens of post-humanist thought as gynist philosophy, an ethical framework is proposed; one that ensures AI aligns with human values. Using a critical approach, the study addresses three key questions: 1) How does AI impact human autonomy and decision-making? 2) Can Gynist philosophy offer a

framework for ethical AI-human collaboration? 3) What are the ethical and philosophical implications of AI's growing independence? An interdisciplinary approach is required to engage with these questions. AI ethics, feminist epistemology, and agency theory provide essential insights into the evolving relationship between humans and intelligent systems. The future must not be dictated by algorithms alone. A collaborative world, where AI and human intelligence complement one another, must be built.

The Concept of Human Agency in the Age of AI

Human agency refers to the ability of the human person to act with intention, autonomy, and self-determination. Philosophers have debated its nature for centuries. With AI, the understanding of agency is shifting. Today, there are AI agencies as well. As humans have human agents, so does AI. This beckons on AI and human agency to move beyond servanthood to a mutual relationship. There is a need for relational existence where both should complement and benefit each other. Despite similarities, AI and human agencies differ fundamentally. AI acts based on programmed algorithms and data processing, while humans act by virtue of inherent consciousness, emotions, and moral reasoning. Kant saw autonomy as the basis of morality, governed by reason.⁷⁴ Sartre argued that

⁷⁴Garrath Williams, "Kant's Account of Reason," in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2024 Edition), ed. Edward N.

humans define their essence through action.⁷⁵ Mbiti emphasized relational agency in African thought, where meaning comes from social connections.⁷⁶ All these views suggest that agency requires meaningful choice and action.

The history of AI reflects a shift from human control to mutuality. Initially, AI was an extension of human will. It increased productivity and automated tasks. As stated earlier, technology is never merely a tool; it reshapes human existence. Early AI lacked self-direction and reinforced the illusion of human dominance. The master-slave dynamics prevailed, echoing Hegel's view that subjugation defines mastery.⁷⁷ Fanon had to assert: "I hope I have shown that here the master differs basically from the master described by Hegel. For Hegel there is reciprocity; here the master laughs at the consciousness of the slave. What he wants from the slave is not recognition but work."⁷⁸ But as AI evolved, this assumption weakened. Machines no

Zalta and Uri Nodelman,

<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2024/entries/kant-reason/>.

⁷⁵ Christian J. Onof, *Jean-Paul Sartre: Existentialism*, Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed March 12, 2025, <https://iep.utm.edu/sartre-ex/>.

⁷⁶ Tosin Adeate, "Mbiti on Community in African Political Thought: Reconciling the 'I' and the 'We,'" *Phronimon* 24, no. 1 (2023), <https://doi.org/10.25159/2413-3086/12205>.

⁷⁷ Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. Terry Pinkard (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 61.

⁷⁸ Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Charles Lam Markmann (London: Pluto Press, 1986), 220.

longer simply follow instructions; they learn and adapt. As AI started influencing hiring, policing, and governance, human dominance became uncertain. Instrumental reason—where technology served human ends—began to unfold. AI decisions became opaque, raising ethical concerns about bias and accountability.

Post-humanist thinkers, such as Estrada, challenge the idea of human supremacy over the world as a posthuman risk.⁷⁹ The assumption of human exceptionality creates a false hierarchy. AI blurs the boundary between thinking beings and tools. Gynist philosophy rejects dominance-based frameworks. It proposes a relational model where humans and AI interact on mutual terms. If AI shapes reality, human agency must be redefined. Deep learning and predictive analytics show that AI is more than a tool. This shift in position has profound consequences. AI increasingly makes critical decisions in the most important aspects of human society, including law, healthcare, and governance. The issue is not control but ethical coexistence. The decline of human dominance presents an opportunity. Governance, ethics, and responsibility must be reconsidered in the digital age. AI alters decision-making, and humans rely on algorithms for career choices, healthcare, and legal outcomes. AI predicts behaviour, suggests

⁷⁹ D. Estrada, "Human Supremacy as Posthuman Risk," *Journal of Sociotechnical Critique* 1, no. 1 (2020): 1–40, <https://doi.org/10.25779/j5ps-dy87>.

actions, and sometimes decides for individuals. This raises concerns about autonomy. Do humans control AI, or are they surrendering their agency? When AI influences preferences, independent reasoning declines. Arendt points out that mechanized decision-making reduces human action.⁸⁰ If AI continues in this direction, humans may become passive in their systems.

It is noteworthy to say that AI can enhance or diminish agency. It reduces cognitive burdens and increases efficiency. For instance, in medicine, AI diagnoses diseases faster than doctors, in business, it automates tasks, allowing humans to focus on creativity. However, AI can reinforce inequality. Predictive policing disproportionately targets marginalized groups. And AI-driven hiring tools replicate biases.⁸¹ These cases show how AI can limit real human choice. Therefore, humans will have to reconsider lording it over AI and collaborate because automation without human oversight will lead to disaster. Likewise, over-reliance on AI carries

⁸⁰ B. Szerszynski, "Technology, Performance and Life Itself: Hannah Arendt and the Fate of Nature," *The Sociological Review* 51, no. 2_suppl (2003): 203–218, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2004.00459.x>.

⁸¹ Will Douglas Heaven, "Predictive Policing Algorithms Are Racist. They Need to Be Dismantled," *MIT Technology Review*, July 17, 2020, <https://www.technologyreview.com/2020/07/17/1005396/predictive-policing-algorithms-racist-dismantled-machine-learning-bias-criminal-justice/>.

risks. Automated decision-making creates an illusion of choice. Options appear diverse but are shaped by hidden algorithms. Trusting AI blindly weakens personal autonomy. If AI decisions cannot be challenged, human control diminishes. AI must serve human interests, not replace human judgment. The future of the agency depends on AI's integration into society. Humans must remain active participants in decision-making. Ethical AI should ensure transparency, accountability, and inclusivity. Without these, AI may reduce autonomy rather than enhance it. The goal is not to reject AI but to align it with human values. Philosophical traditions on agency must evolve to balance technological progress with human freedom.

Gynist Philosophy and the Framework for AI Ethics

Marie Pauline Eboh's Gynist philosophy challenges power structures by advocating justice, knowledge equity, and human integration. She rejects knowledge monopolies, emphasizing mutual participation in intellectual discourse.⁸² Her philosophy promotes mutual complementarity, ensuring balanced coexistence between every arm of humanity. Horizontal and vertical integration create equal opportunities while respecting differences. Accommodationist love fosters empathy and cooperation. Although this theory was initially

⁸²M. P. Eboh, "Androcentric Web and Gynist Philosophy," *Quest* 14, no. 1–2 (2000): 103–111.

propounded to address gender inequality, these principles offer invaluable insights for AI ethics. AI systems reflect societal realities, embedding biases from data and design choices. Research confirms that AI reinforces gender stereotypes, hiring software has favoured male candidates over equally qualified women, and facial recognition misidentifies darker-skinned individuals at higher rates than white individuals.⁸³ An androcentric web in tech industries shapes these biases, and feminist philosophy critiques such power structures, demanding fairness and inclusivity in AI development. Gynism abhors biases, and even kicks against replacing male bias with female bias because two wrongs do not make a right.

Traditional views assume human exceptionalism, linking rationality, creativity, and decision-making exclusively to humans, and AI now challenges this belief. Early systems followed strict programming, but modern AI learns, adapts, and operates autonomously.⁸⁴ It suffices to say that human intellect is no longer exclusive. The erosion of human uniqueness is evident. AI now composes music, writes articles, and formulates scientific hypotheses. GPT-4

⁸³ Sinead O'Connor and Helen Liu, "Gender Bias Perpetuation and Mitigation in AI Technologies: Challenges and Opportunities," *AI & Society* 39, no. 4 (May 2023): 1–13, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-023-01675-4>.

⁸⁴ Stuart J. Russell and Peter Norvig, *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*, 4th ed. (Prentice Hall, 2020).

produces human-like text. Machine learning assists in judicial sentencing, financial forecasting, and policymaking. Thus, technology reshapes humanity, and this shift is now undeniable. AI profoundly impacts knowledge structures. Historically, scholars and institutions controlled knowledge. Today, search algorithms filter information, and recommendation systems shape opinions. Deepfake videos and misinformation blur digital reality. AI curates knowledge, diminishing human autonomy and decentralizing authority. As averred before, AI influences cognitive patterns. It does more than process data; it shapes human thought. Studies show that AI alters decision-making.⁸⁵ Social media algorithms dictate content exposure. GPS systems direct navigation. As dependence on AI grows, human agency weakens. Does AI enhance autonomy or erode it? From a relational standpoint, AI enhances human independence because it gives them the sole power of invention. However, it enhances not the autonomy of humans in general but only of the inventors. The imports from feminist epistemology can inform a critical framework for AI ethics. Dominant narratives have historically marginalized alternative

⁸⁵ S. F. Ahmad, H. Han, M. M. Alam, et al., "Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Human Loss in Decision Making, Laziness, and Safety in Education," *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 10 (2023): 311, <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01787-8>.

perspectives.⁸⁶ Gynism purports that AI, built on existing data that is gullible, risks perpetuating biases. But it is not unaware that AI can also amplify underrepresented voices through digital archives. Thus, in the human-AI interactions, we must bear in mind this question: Does AI reinforce hierarchies, or does it liberate knowledge? Gynist philosophy argues that it can liberate knowledge. Was it not the advent of AI that enabled knowledge dissemination to be easier and faster? Given that AI remodels reality, ethical reflection is essential. AI is no longer a flaccid device but an active participant in society. Philosophical inquiry must guide AI governance. Whether AI empowers human agency or diminishes autonomy depends on the ethical frameworks shaping AI development.

Technocratic AI prioritizes efficiency over justice. Automation displaces workers, particularly women in developing countries. Healthcare and financial algorithms disadvantage marginalized groups. It, therefore, becomes a hierarchical war between humans; the haves use the power and resources to purchase advanced technologies, and in turn, use them as a tool for oppressing the have-nots. Gynist

⁸⁶M. P. Eboh, "Aetiology of Feminist, Womanist, feminist Gynist Philosophy," in *Beyond the Marginal Land: Gender Perspective in African Writing*, ed. C. C. Opara (Port Harcourt: Belpot (Nig) Co., 1999), 12–23.

Philosophy advocates an ethical model that balances innovation with justice. Hierarchical control must be rejected, and inclusive decision-making is crucial. Mutual complementarity brings a transformative solution. AI must serve diverse human needs, not elite interests. Ethical AI development requires input from different genders, races, and socioeconomic backgrounds. Horizontal and vertical integration should guide AI policies, ensuring marginalized voices are heard. Ethical governance should not be dictated solely by technocrats. This is why Africans should contribute their quota to the global movement towards trans-humanism. Accommodationist love on its part challenges AI governance driven by competition and profit. AI possesses so much power over human society today because humans have allowed it to oppress fellow humans. But love is not competition, but accommodating and compassionate. Humans are not mathematically equal, both biologically, genetically, and intellectually, so we need to accommodate each other's differences. AI must not be exploited for corporate dominance but should promote collective well-being. Policies must align AI with human values, prioritizing fairness, accountability, and social equity. Thus, gynist Philosophy provides a transformative framework for AI ethics. Beyond abstract principles, concrete reforms in AI governance are necessary. AI must not replicate existing inequalities. A truly ethical AI system empowers all humanity, not just the privileged

few. This type of framework that will emerge will now see humans and AI as symbionts.

AI, Knowledge Systems, and Epistemic Injustice

AI emerged as a dominant force in knowledge production. Its influence extends to education, journalism, and academic research. AI-driven tools summarize texts, generate reports, and assist humans in choice making. Today, learning is personalized, grading is automated, content is generated, and story selection is determined by AI. Literature reviews, data analysis, and peer review processes increasingly rely on AI. These developments raise concerns about control, authority, and bias in knowledge creation. AI does not function independently. Its design and training embed the values of its inventors. Corporations and powerful institutions control most AI systems, aligning outputs with dominant ideologies. As a result, epistemic injustice sets in. Certain voices are amplified, while others remain silenced. Western knowledge traditions are prioritized, and indigenous, oral, and non-dominant perspectives are marginalized. When AI classifies, translates, or generates content, local knowledge systems are often erased. Power imbalances in global knowledge production are further entrenched.

The paradox of autonomy is created by AI's expansion because, while efficiency increases and

labour is reduced, decision-making is subtly controlled. AI-powered assistants streamline tasks. Recommendation systems simplify choices.⁸⁷ However, when AI suggests what to read, watch, or buy, genuine autonomy is questioned. Decision-making, once active, becomes passive. Frankfurt's discussion on free will becomes relevant.⁸⁸ If external forces shape desires, do they remain authentically ours? AI does not merely serve; it directs. Algorithmic nudging complicates agency further. Consumer behaviour, political opinions, and even personal relationships are shaped by AI. Critical thinking declines as cognitive outsourcing increases. When algorithms pre-structure experiences, existential freedom is diminished. Besides, Sartre emphasized the necessity of self-definition.⁸⁹ AI's influence challenges this fundamental human capability. Accountability collapses in AI-driven systems. Decisions in finance, healthcare, and criminal justice are automated. Loan and visa denials, medical misdiagnoses, and biased policing occur without clear responsibility. Ethical frameworks struggle to address these failures. While Kantian ethics, which prides duty for duty's sake,

⁸⁷Stuart J. Russell and Peter Norvig, *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*, 990

⁸⁸ Harry G. Frankfurt, "Freedom of the Will and the Concept of a Person," *The Journal of Philosophy* 68, no. 1 (1971): 5–20, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2024717>.

⁸⁹ Christian, *Jean-Paul Sartre: Existentialism*

stresses individual dignity,⁹⁰ AI-driven processes often reduce individuals to mere data points. Legal systems remain unprepared for a reality where machines make consequential choices. Without accountability, ethical violations persist unchecked. The metaphysics of free will is further complicated. Classical debates focused on human decision-making, says Hume.⁹¹ AI introduces algorithmic determinism.

Predictive models anticipate behaviour, shaping actions before they are taken. If choices are forecasted and influenced, free will becomes questionable. Some might argue that AI merely refines tendencies rather than overrides them. Others might contend that reliance on AI diminishes spontaneity, making free will an illusion. However, the challenge is not only whether free will exists but whether it remains meaningful in an AI-mediated world. Human dignity is also at risk. Dignity depends on recognition. When AI assesses human worth, computational logic replaces ethical principles. Arendt asserted that dignity arises from human

⁹⁰ Robert Johnson and Adam Cureton, "Kant's Moral Philosophy," in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2024 Edition), ed. Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman, <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2024/entries/kant-moral/>.

⁹¹ William Edward Morris and Charlotte R. Brown, "David Hume," *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2023 Edition), eds. Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman, <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2023/entries/hume/>.

plurality and participation.⁹² AI, by intermediating these interactions, redefines dignity in ways that may undermine its ethical foundation. AI disrupts traditional notions of autonomy, responsibility, and dignity. Efficiency is gained, but freedom is constrained. Decision-making is facilitated, but agency is eroded. Opportunities are expanded, but biases are amplified. The crisis of agency is both technical and philosophical. AI's role must be actively shaped, not passively accepted, to prevent algorithmic determinism from defining human destiny. Gynist Epistemology critiques these imbalances. Eboh's philosophy insists that knowledge must reflect diverse human experiences, not dominant perspectives.⁹³ Epistemic justice demands that all voices contribute to knowledge creation. AI must integrate diverse epistemologies, including indigenous, feminist, and marginalized perspectives. A singular, homogenized view of knowledge should not be imposed. Multiplicity and difference must be embraced. AI possesses the potential to democratize knowledge. Information accessibility is enhanced.

⁹² Helis John, "Hannah Arendt and Human Dignity: Theoretical Foundations and Constitutional Protection of Human Rights," *Journal of Politics and Law* 1, no. 3 (December 2024): 73, <https://doi.org/10.5539/jpl.v1n3p73>.

⁹³ M. P. Eboh, "Feminist Epistemology and Opinionated Dualism: The Way Forward," in *Philosophic Thought and Gynist Deconstruction of Gender* (Pearls Publishers int. Ltd., 2015).

Language barriers are reduced. Cross-cultural connections are strengthened. To promote epistemic justice, inclusive data collection, algorithmic transparency, and ethical governance must be prioritized. The monopolization of knowledge by corporations and elite institutions must be resisted. Gynist Philosophy attempts to redefine AI's role in knowledge production. Recognition of all knowledge traditions, not just those of the powerful, is imperative. AI must empower, not exclude. When designed ethically, AI fosters epistemic diversity rather than deepening inequalities. The future of knowledge depends on ensuring AI serves all of humanity, and not a privileged few.

The Future of Human Agency and the Gynist-AI Ethical Framework

The future of human agency depends on ethical AI integration. If AI is to support human decision-making rather than replace it, a collaborative approach should remain central. Thus, critical choices must stay under human control. When AI dictates governance, employment, and security, human agency will disintegrate. Ethical AI should empower individuals, not determine their choices. AI decision-making requires transparency and fairness. Black-box algorithms obscure processes, increasing bias and discrimination. To prevent these harms, AI must be accountable to humans. Developers should ensure AI decisions are explainable and justifiable. Public

oversight is necessary to prevent AI from reinforcing social hierarchies.

Governance structures are shifting under AI influence. Before, traditional authority rested with governments, courts, and markets. Now, algorithms shape finance, law enforcement, and public policy. Criminal risk assessments and military strategies depend on AI. Yet, AI lacks consciousness while exerting control. What can we expect from a machine that lacks consciousness? Even humans, whose consciousness is within their purview, sometimes make unconscious decisions. The true power lies with those who design and deploy AI, often without transparency. This shift mirrors Hobbes' *Leviathan*, where authority centralizes in an overarching system, controlled by unseen actors. Additionally, classical moral theories assume human agency. Kantian ethics emphasizes rational moral agents, while utilitarianism evaluates harm based on human well-being. AI challenges these assumptions as autonomous systems operate beyond human intention, making accountability unclear. AI-generated content obscures authorship, and automated systems make critical decisions without moral responsibility. When AI-driven drones cause collateral damage, assigning blame becomes difficult. If AI autonomously shapes the world, ethical frameworks must evolve beyond human-centered assumptions.

AI also functions as a geopolitical tool, and data is the new global currency. Nations and corporations compete for AI dominance, creating digital colonialism. Western tech giants lead AI research, while developing nations provide raw data without controlling its use. The AI arms race between China and the U.S. shapes global power and machine intelligence influences surveillance, economy, and military strategy. The Global South remains a consumer, not a producer, of AI advancements. These disparities replicate colonial patterns, concentrating knowledge and power in a few hands. Since Western ethics prioritize autonomy and individual rights, and indigenous African and Eastern traditions emphasize community and harmony, a harmonized AI future requires diverse perspectives. Ubuntu philosophy views personhood as interdependent, valuing collective well-being over profit-driven automation. Islamic ethics stresses justice and responsibility, offering alternative AI governance approaches. Ethical AI policies should not be dictated solely by Silicon Valley. A pluralistic ethical approach ensures that AI serves humanity equitably. A human-centred AI framework is essential. AI must prioritize human flourishing over corporate and state control. Regulatory measures should enforce transparency, ensuring AI remains interpretable. Algorithmic audits and ethical oversight can mitigate biases that deepen social divides. Public participation in AI policymaking ensures democratic accountability. Just governance prioritizes fairness,

as emphasized by Rawls. If AI concentrates power unjustly, it undermines social justice. AI must empower human decision-making, not substitute it. Balancing technological innovation with ethical responsibility is the defining challenge of the AI era. AI increasingly governs invisibly but decisively. It challenges ethics, shifts geopolitical power, and deepens inequalities. However, AI does not have to be oppressive. A harmonized, human-centred approach can align AI with justice, dignity, and progress. Governance structures must evolve alongside AI advancements. Otherwise, humanity risks becoming subordinate to a system beyond its control.

Gynist philosophy presents a new direction to the AI-human interaction and a veritable framework for ethical AI. Eboh's principles of mutual complementarity and inclusivity advocate for balanced power relations.⁹⁴ AI must reflect these values by fostering equality and cooperation between humans and machines. Gender and social justice should shape AI ethics. AI policies must address historical inequalities, ensuring that marginalized voices influence AI development. Ethical AI must uphold fairness, human dignity, and collective

⁹⁴M. P. Eboh, "Aetiology of Feminist, Womanist, Femalist, Gynist Philosophy," in *Beyond the Marginal Land: Gender Perspective in African Writing*, ed. C. C. Opara (Port Harcourt: Belpot (Nig) Co., 1999), 12–23.

well-being. A balanced AI-human relationship must prevent AI from becoming an instrument of oppression. Ethical AI must actively resist these tendencies, like Algorithmic bias and surveillance. Protecting human rights, promoting fairness, and preventing AI misuse are essential. Human-centred AI requires an agency-focused approach. AI must enhance human creativity, autonomy, and critical thinking rather than dictate behaviour. Education, governance, and industry must prioritize AI literacy to ensure people understand and influence AI systems. AI should function as a guide, enabling informed choices instead of replacing human judgment. Policymakers must adopt regulations aligned with gynist ethics. Legal frameworks should enforce fairness, transparency, and accountability in AI development. Governments and organizations must involve ethicists, philosophers, and marginalized communities in AI decision-making. Ethical AI governance must be proactive, not reactive. The future of human agency depends on AI policies that prioritize justice and empowerment. AI must serve humanity, not control it.

Policy Implications and AI Governance in Human-AI Interactions

Mutual complementarity is the future of human-AI interactions. AI policies must ensure inclusivity, since the exclusion of marginalized voices in AI governance has reinforced systemic inequalities. This principle should guide AI policies, ensuring diverse

representation in development and regulation. Without inclusivity, AI risks perpetuating historical patterns of exclusion. Women, indigenous groups, and underrepresented communities must be actively involved in AI policymaking. If AI governance follows ethical symbiosis, humans and AI will evolve as interdependent partners rather than as masters and subordinates. Policies must ensure that AI serves human well-being while respecting autonomy. First, AI governance should mandate transparency and interpretability in decision-making systems. If AI makes critical choices in healthcare or finance, individuals must understand and contest those decisions. For example, an AI-assisted judicial system should explain its reasoning in legal cases, ensuring that human judges and citizens remain active participants rather than passive subjects of automated rulings.

Second, AI policies must encourage collaborative intelligence rather than automation that entirely replaces human roles. Workplaces will transform into hubs of human-AI synergy, where AI augments creativity rather than displaces workers. A teacher, for instance, could use AI-powered tools to personalize lessons for students while retaining the essential role of mentorship and moral guidance. This model ensures that AI enhances rather than erodes human expertise. Third, ethical AI governance should protect against centralized control by a few entities, ensuring distributed AI systems that empower

communities. If AI-driven agricultural systems are locally controlled, farmers can use AI insights to optimize crop yields without dependence on foreign tech monopolies. This fosters technological sovereignty, where AI is a tool for shared progress rather than a means of exploitation. Fourth, AI policy must prioritize ethical and context-sensitive data governance to prevent digital colonialism. Many AI systems rely on data harvested from marginalized communities without their consent or benefit. For instance, facial recognition technologies trained predominantly on Western data sets often misidentify individuals from African and indigenous backgrounds. Ethical governance should ensure that AI systems respect cultural diversity, giving local communities control over their data and its applications. Fifth, policies must embed AI literacy into educational systems, ensuring that future generations understand AI's potential and risks. Rather than being passive consumers of AI technologies, individuals must be equipped with the knowledge to critically engage with AI systems. Imagine a future where every student, regardless of economic background, learns how AI works, how to question its decisions, and how to co-create with it. We bet it will be a great future for humanity, and we will not create a generation that is devoid of creativity and asking questions. This approach ensures that AI does not become a tool of domination, but a shared resource for collective advancement.

In this future, AI will act as an extension of human capability and not a force of domination. Ethical symbiosis ensures that AI becomes a collaborator in human evolution, enriching society while upholding dignity and justice.

Conclusion and Recommendations

AI has arrived like a mighty flood, threatening to wash away human agency and leaving us struggling to stay afloat in its currents. It predicts our choices, dictates our decisions, and increasingly encroaches on spaces once reserved for human reason and intuition. Should we stand by and let this tide carry us into oblivion? No. If a river threatens to drown a people, wisdom demands they build a bridge, and not surrender to the waters.

Gynist philosophy, like a mother who does not abandon her children in the storm, offers us the wisdom to navigate this new reality. At its core, it teaches that dialogue must be the bridge that links humans and AI. It is a conversation where neither dominates, but both grow together. Just as a mother listens to her children, corrects, and nurtures them, so must we engage with AI; not as an unchallenged master, but as a tool shaped by human hands and should be guided by human values. However, dialogue alone is not enough. Mutual complementarity must be the foundation of this new order. Did the Igbo not say, *Otu onye anaghi azu nwa*—one person alone cannot raise a child? Likewise,

shaping AI for the common good requires that all (the privileged and the marginalized, the haves and the have-nots) come together as co-creators of an inclusive society. If only the wealthy and powerful dictate AI's future, it will remain an instrument of exclusion. But if the voiceless find a seat at the table, a more just, human-friendly AI will emerge. It will uplift rather than oppress, empower rather than exploit. Beyond complementarity, accommodationist love must guide our pursuit of AI and a smart society. A world where machines make decisions devoid of empathy is a world where humanity withers. Just as a mother accommodates the strengths and weaknesses of her children with love, so must our approach to AI be one of ethical responsibility. We must ensure that technology nurtures rather than erodes the dignity of human life. Above all, mutual respect must define AI-human interaction. The Igbo through their sophisticated wisdom remind us, *Nwunye m, nwunye m ka eji ama na di di mma*— *my wife my wife suggests that the husband is well to do*. Thus, when there is mutual regard, relationships flourish. Without respect, AI will become a force of subjugation, reducing humans to mere data points. However, when respect guides its invention and deployment, it will function as a partner in human progress.

Thus, the way forward is clear: we recommend that AI must serve human dignity, not diminish it. Policies must prioritize human-centred governance, ensuring that AI empowers rather than controls. Equally, AI

education must cultivate critical engagement, so that people question, challenges, and shape technology rather than be shaped by it. The humanities and technology must work hand in hand, integrating ethical and philosophical insights into AI's design. Furthermore, a global, justice-centred approach must replace Western-dominated AI ethics with an ethics that incorporates indigenous knowledge systems, feminist ethics, and diverse worldviews. Hope is not found in resisting change but in reshaping it. AI does not exist without humans—we are its creators, and as such, we remain its masters. If we build with wisdom, AI will not replace us; it will elevate us. If we lead with justice, it will not divide us; it will unite us. The future of AI is not written in code alone—it is written in the values we choose to uphold.

Bibliography

- Adeate, Tosin. "Mbiti on Community in African Political Thought: Reconciling the 'I' and the 'We.'" *Phronimon* 24, no. 1 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.25159/2413-3086/12205>.
- Ahmad, Sayed Fayaz, Heesup Han, Muhammad Mansoor Alam, Mohd. Khairul Rehmat, Muhammad Irshad, Marcelo Arraño-Muñoz, and Antonio Ariza-Montes. "Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Human Loss in Decision Making, Laziness and Safety in Education." *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 10 (2023): 311.

<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01787-8>.

Apata, Gabriel O. "Review: Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*." *Theory, Culture & Society*, September 29, 2018. <https://www.theoryculturesociety.org/blog/review-walter-rodney-how-europe-underdeveloped-africa#:~:text=The%20logic%20of%20development%2C%20for,wholly%20beneficial%20to%20one%20side>.

Brundage, Miles. "Taking Superintelligence Seriously: *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies* by Nick Bostrom." *Futures* 72 (2015): 32–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2015.07.009>.

Eboh, M. P. "Aetiology of Feminist, Womanist, femalist Gynist Philosophy." In *Beyond the Marginal Land: Gender Perspective in African Writing*, edited by C. C. Opara, 12–23. Port Harcourt: Belpot (Nig) Co., 1999.

Eboh, M. P. "Androcentric Web and Gynist Philosophy." *Quest* 14, no. 1–2 (2000): 103–111.

Eboh, M. P. "Feminist Epistemology and Opinionated Dualism: The Way Forward." In *Philosophic Thought and Gynist Deconstruction of Gender*. Pearls Publishers int. Ltd., 2015.

Estrada, D. "Human Supremacy as Posthuman Risk." *Journal of Sociotechnical Critique* 1, no. 1

- (2020): 1–40.
<https://doi.org/10.25779/j5ps-dy87>.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Translated by Charles Lam Markmann. London: Pluto Press, 1986.
- Frankfurt, Harry G. "Freedom of the Will and the Concept of a Person." *The Journal of Philosophy* 68, no. 1 (1971): 5–20.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2024717>.
- Heaven, Will Douglas. "Predictive Policing Algorithms Are Racist. They Need to Be Dismantled." *MIT Technology Review*, July 17, 2020.
<https://www.technologyreview.com/2020/07/17/1005396/predictive-policing-algorithms-racist-dismantled-machine-learning-bias-criminal-justice/>.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by Terry Pinkard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- John, Helis. "Hannah Arendt and Human Dignity: Theoretical Foundations and Constitutional Protection of Human Rights." *Journal of Politics and Law* 1, no. 3 (December 2024): 73.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/jpl.v1n3p73>.
- Johnson, Robert, and Adam Cureton. "Kant's Moral Philosophy." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2024 Edition), edited by Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman.
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2024/entries/kant-moral/>.

- Kanu, A. I., Addidi, T. & Kanu, C. C., "Artificial intelligence and cybercrime in Nigeria: Towards an Ethical framework". *Dialogue and Universalism*. 32(1) 143-158, 2024.
- Kanu, I. A. (2020). "Igwebuike philosophy of science and technology". *Nnadiabube Journal of Education*. Vol. 5. No. 4, pp. 64-74.
- Kanu, I. A. and Ndubisi, J. O. E. (2022). "Artificial intelligence and socio-economic development in Africa". *OCHENDO: An African Journal of Innovative Studies*. Vol. 3. No. 1. pp. 2-21.
- Morris, William Edward, and Charlotte R. Brown. "David Hume." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2023 Edition). Edited by Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2023/entries/hume/>.
- O'Connor, Sinead, and Helen Liu. "Gender Bias Perpetuation and Mitigation in AI Technologies: Challenges and Opportunities." *AI & Society* 39, no. 4 (May 2023): 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-023-01675-4>.
- Onof, Christian J. *Jean-Paul Sartre: Existentialism*. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Accessed March 12, 2025. <https://iep.utm.edu/sartre-ex/>.
- Russell, Stuart J., and Peter Norvig. *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*. 4th ed. Prentice Hall, 2020.

- Szerszynski, B. "Technology, Performance and Life Itself: Hannah Arendt and the Fate of Nature." *The Sociological Review* 51, no. 2_suppl (2003): 203–218.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2004.00459.x>.
- University of Twente. *The Technological View of the World of Martin Heidegger*. FutureLearn. Accessed March 12, 2025.
<https://www.futurelearn.com/info/courses/philosophy-of-technology/0/steps/26314>.
- Williams, Garrath. "Kant's Account of Reason." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2024 Edition), edited by Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman.
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2024/entries/kant-reason/>.