







INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ISSN:2277-7881(Print); IMPACT FACTOR: 9.014(2025); IC VALUE: 5.16; ISI VALUE: 2.286

PEER REVIEWED AND REFEREED INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

(Fulfilled Suggests Parameters of UGC by IJMER) Volume:14, Issue:11(6), November, 2025

Scopus Review ID: A2B96D3ACF3FEA2A
Article Received: Reviewed: Accepted
Publisher: Sucharitha Publication, India
Online Copy of Article Publication Available: www.ijmer.in

THE ETHICS OF TECHNOLOGY IN THE MODERN WORLD: A PHILOSOPHICAL VIEW

Pabitra Sabar

KSUB Degree College, Bhanjanagar

Abstract

This essay critically explores the ethical implications of technology in contemporary society through a philosophical lens. It examines foundational debates between technological determinism and human agency, drawing on thinkers such as Heidegger and Feenberg to question whether technology shapes society autonomously or serves as a neutral tool. The discussion incorporates Hans Jonas's ethics of responsibility and the precautionary principle, emphasizing the need for foresight in addressing the unpredictable consequences of powerful innovations like artificial intelligence and genetic engineering. Issues of privacy, autonomy, and surveillance are analysed in the context of digital capitalism, referencing Foucault's panopticon and deontological ethics. The essay further investigates questions of moral agency and accountability in AI, as well as the demands for justice and equity posed by the digital divide and algorithmic bias, engaging with Rawlsian and contemporary social justice frameworks. Finally, it considers technology's role in human flourishing, contrasting the potential for enhanced well-being with risks of alienation and manipulation. The essay concludes that a nuanced, multidisciplinary ethical approach—grounded in both classical and contemporary philosophy—is essential for guiding technological development in ways that promote justice, autonomy, and the common good.

INTRODUCTION

In the twenty-first century, technology permeates every aspect of human life, from communication and healthcare to education and entertainment. While technological advancements have brought undeniable benefits, they also raise profound ethical questions. Philosophical inquiry into the ethics of technology is crucial for understanding not only what we can do with technology, but what we ought to do. The relentless progression of technology in the modern world has prompted not only practical and regulatory responses but also deep philosophical inquiry. As technology reshapes societies, economies, and even conceptions of personhood, it becomes imperative to interrogate its ethical dimensions. This essay critically examines the ethical issues that arise from technological advancement through the lens of major philosophical traditions, drawing on both historical and contemporary sources.

Technological Determinism and Human Agency

The relationship between technology and society is a central theme in the philosophy of technology. Technological determinism, as articulated by thinkers like Jacques Ellul and Langdon Winner, posits that technology is an autonomous force shaping human values and societal structures, often beyond our control. In contrast, the instrumentalist view, championed by philosophers such as Andrew Feenberg, holds that technology is a neutral tool, its moral value contingent on human intentions and uses.

However, this dichotomy is increasingly challenged. As Heidegger argues in "The Question Concerning Technology" (1954), technology is not merely a collection of tools but a mode of revealing—a way in which the world is disclosed to us. This ontological perspective compels us to rethink human agency: we are both creators and products of technological systems, responsible for shaping the ethical horizons they open. At its core, technology is a tool—a means to extend human capabilities. Yet, as philosopher Martin Heidegger noted, technology is not neutral; it shapes the way we see and interact with the world. This brings forth questions about responsibility: Who is accountable for the consequences of technological innovations? Should it be the inventors, the users, governments, or society at large?









INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ISSN:2277-7881(Print); IMPACT FACTOR: 9.014(2025); IC VALUE: 5.16; ISI VALUE: 2.286

PEER REVIEWED AND REFEREED INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

(Fulfilled Suggests Parameters of UGC by IJMER) Volume:14, Issue:11(6), November, 2025

Scopus Review ID: A2B96D3ACF3FEA2A
Article Received: Reviewed: Accepted
Publisher: Sucharitha Publication, India
Online Copy of Article Publication Available: www.ijmer.in

Philosophers such as Hans Jonas argue that our responsibility grows with our power. As technology gives us unprecedented control over nature and even human life (e.g., genetic engineering), our moral obligations expand accordingly. The precautionary principle suggests that we should err on the side of caution, prioritizing the prevention of harm when the stakes are high and the outcomes uncertain.

Responsibility and the Precautionary Principle

The ethical responsibility of technologists, corporations, and policymakers has grown alongside technology's power to affect the environment and human life. Hans Jonas's principle of responsibility—detailed in *The Imperative of Responsibility* (1979)—argues for an "ethics of responsibility" that anticipates the long-term and potentially catastrophic consequences of technological action. Jonas advocates the famous "heuristics of fear," suggesting that when the risks of technological innovation are unknown or potentially irreparable, we should err on the side of caution.

This stance is particularly salient in the context of emerging technologies like gene editing (CRISPR-Cas9), nanotechnology, and artificial intelligence, where unintended consequences can be profound and global. The precautionary principle, widely discussed in bioethics and environmental ethics, thus becomes a cornerstone for ethical deliberation.

Privacy, Surveillance, and Autonomy

Digital technologies have fundamentally altered the landscape of privacy and autonomy. As philosopher Shoshana Zuboff describes in *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* (2019), the commodification of personal data gives rise to new forms of power and control. Michel Foucault's concept of the panopticon, introduced in *Discipline and Punish* (1975), is often invoked to critique the pervasive surveillance enabled by modern technologies.

From a deontological perspective (Kant), ethical technology must respect individual autonomy, ensuring informed consent and the protection of personal boundaries. The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in the European Union embodies these principles, though challenges remain in a globalized digital ecosystem. Modern technology, particularly digital technology, challenges traditional notions of privacy and autonomy. The widespread collection of personal data by governments and corporations raises concerns about surveillance and individual freedom. Philosophers like Michel Foucault have warned of the "panopticon effect," a situation where individuals modify their behaviour because they could be watched at any time.

From a Kantian perspective, respecting autonomy means treating individuals as ends in themselves, not merely as means to an end (such as profit or control). Thus, ethical technology should empower users, respect their consent, and safeguard their private information.

Philosophers suggest that transparency, accountability, and inclusivity are essential. Stakeholders, including affected communities, should have a voice in shaping the rules that guide AI systems.

Artificial Intelligence, Moral Agency, and Accountability

The advent of artificial intelligence raises pressing questions about moral agency and accountability. While AI systems lack consciousness and intentionality, their capacity to make autonomous decisions—such as in self-driving cars or algorithmic sentencing—complicates traditional notions of responsibility.

Philosophers debate whether machines can be moral agents or whether responsibility should remain with designers, users, or institutions. Luciano Floridi's "information ethics" and Virginia Dignum's work on responsible AI stress the need for









INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ISSN:2277-7881(Print); IMPACT FACTOR: 9.014(2025); IC VALUE: 5.16; ISI VALUE: 2.286 PEER REVIEWED AND REFEREED INTERNATIONAL IOURNAL

(Fulfilled Suggests Parameters of UGC by IJMER)

Volume: 14, Issue: 11(6), November, 2025 Scopus Review ID: A2B96D3ACF3FEA2A Article Received: Reviewed: Accepted Publisher: Sucharitha Publication, India

Online Copy of Article Publication Available: www.ijmer.in transparency, explainability, and the inclusion of diverse stakeholders in algorithmic governance. The ongoing debate

around the "trolley problem" in programming autonomous vehicles exemplifies these challenges. Artificial intelligence (AI) introduces a new layer of ethical complexity. Can machines be moral agents? Who is responsible when an autonomous system causes harm? Utilitarian philosophers might focus on maximizing benefits and minimizing harm, while deontologists emphasize duties and rights. For instance, if a self-driving car must "choose" between two harmful outcomes, how should it decide—and who programs these choices?

Equity, Access, and Social Justice

Technological innovation often exacerbates social inequalities, a phenomenon extensively discussed in the literature on the digital divide. Rawlsian theories of justice, particularly the "difference principle" from A Theory of Justice (1971), argue that social and technological advances are only justifiable if they benefit the least advantaged. This framework demands policies and designs that address disparities in access to digital infrastructure, education, and participation.

Contemporary philosophers such as Ruha Benjamin highlight the ways in which technology can reinforce systemic racism and exclusion, as seen in biased facial recognition algorithms or discriminatory data practices. Ethical reflection must therefore be attentive to issues of equity, inclusion, and power.

Not everyone benefits equally from technology. The "digital divide" refers to the gap between those who have access to digital tools and those who do not, often along lines of wealth, geography, and education. From a Rawlsian perspective of justice, a fair society must ensure that technological advancements do not exacerbate existing inequalities.

Technology and Human Flourishing

Finally, philosophical ethics asks whether technology contributes to or detracts from human flourishing (eudaimonia). Martha Nussbaum and Amartya Sen's capabilities approach provides a framework for evaluating technology's impact on substantive freedoms and well-being. Technologies that promote meaningful relationships, creativity, and understanding align with the Aristotelian ideal of the good life, whereas those that foster alienation, addiction, or manipulation warrant critical scrutiny.

Finally, philosophical reflection asks us to consider what constitutes a good life. Does technology enhance or diminish human flourishing? Technologies that foster genuine connection, creativity, and understanding can be ethically justified, while those that promote addiction, isolation, or manipulation should be scrutinized.

CONCLUSION

The ethics of technology in the modern world encompasses a wide array of philosophical issues, from agency and responsibility to justice and human flourishing. As technology grows ever more complex and influential, ethical reflection must keep pace, informed by theoretical rigor and practical engagement. Drawing upon diverse philosophical traditions enables a more comprehensive and responsible approach to shaping the technological future. Ethical engagement with technology requires ongoing philosophical reflection. As technology evolves, so too must our moral frameworks. By applying principles of responsibility, respect for autonomy, justice, and the promotion of human well-being, we can strive to ensure that technology serves humanity, rather than the other way around.











INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ISSN:2277-7881(Print); IMPACT FACTOR: 9.014(2025); IC VALUE: 5.16; ISI VALUE: 2.286 PEER REVIEWED AND REFEREED INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

(Fulfilled Suggests Parameters of UGC by IJMER)

Volume: 14, Issue: 11(6), November, 2025 Scopus Review ID: A2B96D3ACF3FEA2A Article Received: Reviewed: Accepted Publisher: Sucharitha Publication, India Online Copy of Article Publication Available: www.ijmer.in

References

- 1. Heidegger, M. (1954). The Question Concerning Technology.
- Jonas, H. (1979). The Imperative of Responsibility.
- Rawls, J. (1971). A Theory of Justice. 3.
- 4. Zuboff, S. (2019). The Age of Surveillance Capitalism.
- Foucault, M. (1975). Discipline and punish. 5.
- Nussbaum, M., & Sen, A. (1993). The Quality of Life.