

Ethical Consequentialism in Values and Principles of UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence

Rommel Utungga Pasopati^{1,*}, Chili Podhang Bethari², Dewi Syifanaya Firdausy Nurdin³,
Myrilla Shafa Camila⁴, Sanjaya Ahmad Hidayat⁵

^{1,2}Graduate Students of Magister of Literature, Petra Christian University, Jl. Siwalankerto No. 121-131, Surabaya, Indonesia

^{3,4,5}Undergraduate Students of English Literature, Universitas Dr. Soetomo, Jl. Semolowaru No. 84, Surabaya, Indonesia.

Corresponding author*

rommel@unitomo.ac.id

Abstract: This article exposes the matter of ethical consequentialism in values and principles of UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in 2021. By asserting qualitative approach through explorative method, this paper accentuates the matter of utilitarian perspective in dealing with the various developments of Artificial Intelligence. It is also done to answer the question of 'how may consequentialism be reflected on the values and principles of UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence?'. In analysis, the recommendations are indeed such reactions to the recent development of AI. The utilitarian aspect in that recommendation brings advantages to the existing spread of the usage of AI by not objectifying, undermining, and violating human rights. Consequentialism also widens matters of deontological points by being more flexible to see the process and the desired results. In conclusion, consequentialism may be necessary since it is done to prevent any worse condition regarding to ethical spread of AI. It must also be supplemented with intention to widen any coverage of AI worldwide so that enhanced moral considerations could always be attained.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Consequentialism, Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, UNESCO, Utilitarian Ethics.

Introduction

The development of information and technology is reaching its wider achievements. The idea of data is nothing but the interpreted understandings of information as the main knowledge used by various people (Abramoff, et al, 2020; Chen, et al., 2021). The matters of technology are similar since the extensions of humans' senses as listed in philosophy of technology broaden significance of any automatic and algorithmic visibilities in everyday life. To these days, humans could not totally leave behind any matter of information and technology. Firstly, those who may be left behind will be situated as unique, but then they will must be suited to the recent trends recently (Abramoff, et al, 2020; Wu, et al, 2020).

Information and technology also reach perspectives of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in recent era. Its main idea is to enhance the usage of machines in humans' everyday conceptions. The capabilities of a machine are widened in its computational understandings to surpass the limitations and restrictions of human beings (Abramoff, et al, 2020; Chen, et al., 2021). Some people will say that AI works like a robot, while others may state that AI is mostly about super-computers. Both are totally right since those ideas underline the automation points of AI. In this case, various automations do not come *ex nihilo*, but being understood from any past data involved. The data then being concluded and processed to evaluate humans' interests and help them to make better decisions.

At least there are six main comprehensive concepts of learning in AI. First, machine learning that identifies any data without involving any human experience as well (Abramoff, et al, 2020; Wu, et al, 2020). The experience is only provided as a former data. The process furthermore is quite automatic that could reach its main usage to save people's time. How machines learn is to simplify humans' thoughts and choose which ways that are suitable for a certain interest. Second, deep learning that accentuates the working of a machine in processing inputs by putting several layers of analyses (Abramoff, et al, 2020; Chubb, et al., 2021). Common people do not have to know the process but they may only enjoy the results. The automations work its own ways to classify, infer, and also predict the outcome. Those are in line with the matter of progress in which results are the most important points in this matter. Third, neural networks that mimic humans' neural system to define and to situate problems to be solved (Sigfrids, et al., 2022; Heyder, et al, 2023). In these perceptions, variables are not seen as on surface, but as underlying matters so that any pattern could come out and be analyzed. Indeed, the patterns are the main data that humans' brain processes and this is how neural aspects in AI do their work either.

Fourth, the computational process works in such natural language processing. Indeed, the way Ai works is through language as similar as how humans think. It is like a science that actively reads, understands, and interprets the meanings of various things (Chubb, et al., 2021; Heyder, et al, 2023). AI responds to any communication and is able to respond through automated points of its indications. Fifth, computer vision that processes patterns of shown images. The images may not be the literal data, but those are how the machine indicates the patterns. The machine will break down any part of the object and classify them into categories that will shape various possibilities to be used by humans in the future. Sixth, cognitive computing as the main algorithm of machine in indicating any aspect of its automatic understandings (Chubb, et al., 2021; Wu, et al, 2020). This one is getting closer to humans' conceptions in which any kind of object is analyzed

in its manner to show various desired output. Even the users later could choose which kind that really suits them.

The six points above show two faces of a coin. On a side, advancements of AI are so promising for the human race's development. Matters of progress could always be attained more by using certain points of automatons with the help of algorithmic machines. People must not analyze, count, and predict anything by themselves, but they could use other brains to help them (Heyder, et al, 2023). On the other hand, the more AI comes into humans' life, they could easily eradicate the true nature of human beings alongside with their uniqueness. AI is considered much better than AI since AI is emotionless that does not need any special treatment. Moreover, the raising of machine in its main narrow, general, and super intelligence could somehow surpass and objectify humans under the perceptions of such machines (Heyder, et al, 2023; Wu, et al, 2020). When machines have their own intelligence and consciousness, they could be smarter than human beings. This is surely problematic for existence of human beings in its philosophical and practical contexts. Various jobs could easily be surpassed by the existence of machines and the existence of personal human beings may be derogated as well.

United Nations (UN) does not do nothing according to the advancement of AI. This international organization through its organ named United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) on 2021 responded this situation by publishing an official Recommendations on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (UNESCO, 2021). The background of this recommendation is based two indications of values and principles in te developments of AI. Those perceptions are quite ethical that underline significances and impacts of relations between AI and human beings. Those ideas are the main emphasizes in this article alongside with analysis on ethical [points of consequentialism.

By indicating the points in the Recommendations on AI by UNESCO, this paper would like to answer the question of 'how may consequentialism be reflected on values and principles of UNESCO's Recommendation on the

Ethics of Artificial Intelligence?'. In analysis, the recommendations indeed such reaction to recent development of AI. The utilitarian aspect in that recommendation may bring advantages and disadvantages as well. It may bring benefit to the existing spread of the usage of AI by not objectifying, undermining, and violating human rights. On the other hand, it may raise problems of justifying wrong answers to moral questions since the ones left by modernism will never be intervened by spreading utilitarian ethical sense. In conclusion, consequentialism may be necessary since it is done to prevent any worse condition regarding the ethical spread of AI. However, it must be supplemented with intention to widen any coverage of AI worldwide so that enhanced moral considerations.

Materials and Methods

By using qualitative method, certain concepts and written data are analyzed to answer the question in this paper. Written through description, online and offline scripts are used to explain correlations between values and principles of Recommendations on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence by UNESCO in 2021 and the matters of ethical consequentialism alongside with literary concepts and cultural studies ideas. Online and offline scripts are derived from books and journals to understand shown matters. The data analysis includes attaining sources, reading sources carefully, comparing with other issues, quoting into paper, and writing down in reference lists. The research data comes from both Recommendations on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence by UNESCO in 2021 and matter of ethical consequentialism arguments. Each of them is read then broken down into its every particular element. The ideas in values and principles of that Recommendation are mainly involved to point significant condition of recent developments of AI. The premises and logics used in ethical consequentialism's ideas are also drawn to underline matter of being suitable to values of human beings. Here, Recommendations on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence by UNESCO in 2021 is the object while matter of ethical

consequentialism is a tool to analyze. More elaborations related to opposite analysis are also provided in addition furthermore.

Results and Discussions

Presuppositions on Values and Principles of Recommendations on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence by UNESCO

Through the understandings on its values and principles, Recommendations on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence by UNESCO in 2021 could be analyzed furthermore. The values of that Recommendation rely on four main points. Those are respect, protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms and human dignity, environment and ecosystem flourishing, ensuring diversity and inclusiveness, and living in peaceful, just and interconnected societies (UNESCO, 2021).

The first aspects of the values indicate the fundamental points of human rights and dignities. UNESCO clearly states that dignity of every human is totally universal, indivisible, inalienable, interdependent and interrelated in main indications of the freedom. The idea of the dignity is not static but needs to be recognized by developments of AI as well (UNESCO, 2021). It is needed to respect, protect, and promote human dignity and rights of intrinsic and equal worth of each individual human being. This indication would like development of AI to go beyond any restrictions and limitations on various hierarchical differentiations such as race, color, gender, age, language, religion, economic or social condition of birth, or even disability (Chen, et al., 2021; UNESCO, 2021). Therefore, any human being and its community should not be harmed or subordinated, whether physically, economically, socially, politically, culturally or mentally during any phase of the life cycle of AI systems.

The main idea of AI then must be used to enhance quality of life of all human beings rather than only left open to such certain individuals and groups. By making it totally open, dignity of any human being could further be guaranteed as to avoid any violation or abuse of human rights and

fundamental freedoms. Moreover, the usage of AI should be focused on those who really need it. Vulnerable people are such concept by UN to prioritize various assistance towards them. Those people are children, older persons, persons with disabilities, or the ill ones (UNESCO, 2021). By prioritizing these people, AI could be really useful in order to shape better equality of human dignities of them and other common people. The actors such as governments, private sector, civil society, international organizations, technical communities, and academia are the ones that need to implement this development to enhance prioritization of AI in everyday life.

The second part in environmental and ecosystem flourishing shows that development of AI must always consider the good existence of humans' natural surroundings. Precaution for development of AI must always be in line with environmental and ecosystem protection and restoration alongside with idea of sustainable development (Chen, et al., 2021; UNESCO, 2021). Reduction of the environmental impact of AI systems must be followed such as carbon footprints in aspect of climate change and environmental risk factors. Unsustainable exploitation in transformation of natural resources contributing to the deterioration of the environment and the degradation of ecosystems must also be stopped and revised.

The third part underlines that enhancement of AI must always pay attention to diversity and inclusiveness. Its main idea must appreciate any heterogeneous condition. Protections and promotions of lifestyle choices, beliefs, opinions, expressions or personal experiences must be prioritized in life cycle of AI (Pasopati, 2018; UNESCO, 2021). Furthermore, any kind of progress must always come up with the effort to overcome the lack of necessary technological infrastructure, education and skills. This one is needed so that AI is not used to homogenize diverse conditions of human beings. As machines, AI must be implemented for the higher reasons and goodness for all human beings without any exception.

The fourth part accentuates matter of AI that must be in line with any supporting ideas

regarding living in peaceful, just and interconnected societies. The idea of being just in the UN's conception is its continuation of interconnected future for the benefit of all in various consistencies with human rights and fundamental freedoms. Every human being belongs to a greater whole that must leave out any kind of selfishness (UNESCO, 2021). Organic solidarities must always be inbounded with developments of AI in which permanent search for peaceful relations between humans and the natural environment could be prolonged.

The peaceful effort must also be enhanced in the indications of development of AI. Inclusiveness, justice, equity, and interconnectedness should be pronounced further by not segregating, objectifying, or undermining freedom (UNESCO, 2021). Autonomous decision-making on matter of safety of human beings and communities must be enhanced either. The usage of AI should also be intended to eradicate any threat towards the coexistence between humans, other living beings and the natural environment.

The four aspects above underline how any development of AI must be presupposed with the values of human beings intrinsically. Any human being must not be harmed by the existence of AI. AI should rather help and enhance the condition of human beings in general. Any inequality should be eliminated by the existence of AI by implementing the values of human beings themselves (Chen, et al., 2021; UNESCO, 2021). In those values, the presuppositions are clear, that are the dignities of human beings full of any diverse situation. Heterogeneous conditions of human beings are also top priority that must be paid attention in any development of AI (Pasopati, 2018). The main idea of AI must never eradicate uniqueness of any human being in any sense.

While the values above are the fundamentals of human rights, the following principles are more practical to guide how development of AI should be directed. In this aspect, the principles are how AI should be reasoned in common logical sense (Bryndin, 2020). The principles also work as such rules and standards for further development of AI. These aspects could also be intended as the main theories in analyzing how development of AI

should be in line with any human dignity in general.

The principles of UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence are related to ten main points. The ideas are expanding from proportionality and do no harm, safety and security, fairness and non-discrimination, sustainability, right to privacy and data protection, human oversight and determination, transparency and explainability, responsibility and accountability, awareness and literacy, and also multi-stakeholder and adaptive governance and collaboration (UNESCO, 2021). Those ten points range from individual and societal points to traditional, modern, and post-modern of essence and existence of any human being.

The first point is about proportionality and does no harm. This one is needed since human and natural ecosystems are mostly ignored by the advancements of information and technology. The development of AI may also tend to do the same manner. Therefore, any legitimate aims or objectives and should be appropriate to the context (UNESCO, 2021). The implementation of procedures for risk assessment and the adoption of measures needs to be perceived to preclude the occurrence of such harm. To ensure the proportionality, AI method should be appropriate and proportional to achieve a given legitimate aim, must not violate or abuse human rights, and must be based on rigorous scientific foundations. AI must have purpose to ensure the prolonging life of any human being. AI must also not be used for social scoring or mass surveillance purposes. In this main case, AI is a tool that must be taken as prioritization of human dignity, rather than making people to be more disciplined.

The second point is on safety and security. Unwanted harms (safety risks) as well as vulnerabilities to attack (security risks) should be avoided and should be addressed, prevented and eliminated throughout the life cycle of AI systems to ensure human, environmental and ecosystem safety and security (UNESCO, 2021). Safe and secure AI will be enabled by the development of sustainable, privacy protective data access frameworks that foster better training and validation of AI models utilizing quality data.

Those principles are simple and straightforward. Those are the main focuses in which security has been widened today. People may not see security as hard issue anymore. It is about human security in modern conceptions today in which all cultural aspects of human beings are the realities of everyday life itself. People do not discuss about military issues, but they speak of privacies, food supplies, fossil fuel consumption, climate change, and any other crucial idea.

The third point accentuates fairness and non-discrimination in which any AI actor should promote social justice and safeguard in compliance with international law. Further inclusive approach must preside the benefits of AI technologies to be available and accessible to all. AI must not worsen any bad condition of vulnerable people in vulnerable position (Chen, et al., 2021; UNESCO, 2021). Furthermore, AI must consider specific needs of different age groups, cultural systems, different language groups, persons with disabilities, girls and women, alongside with disadvantaged and marginalized people. Widened respect for multilingualism and cultural diversities must come forward with any effort to minimize digital divides and ensure inclusive access to participation in the development of AI. Promotion of equity between rural and urban areas must also be enhanced in AI system life cycle through social solidarities (UNESCO, 2021). A fairer world order with regard to information, communication, culture, education, research and socio-economic and political stability should always be realized through further application of enhancements of AI.

The fourth point is related to sustainability of human, social, cultural, economic and environmental dimensions. The continuous assessment of the human, social, cultural, economic and environmental impact of AI technologies should therefore be carried out with full understandings of the implications of AI technologies. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the United Nations must also be the main precedence of any development of AI (Astobiza, et al., 2021; UNESCO, 2021). That is to ensure that the enhancements of various machines must be beneficial for any human being without bringing further damage to various natural and

social surroundings. Therefore, the main idea in AI must be focused on cooperation rather than competition. It is done to realize the significance of values of human rights regarding the principles of this Recommendation from UNESCO.

The fifth point includes matter of right to privacy and data protection. This is needed since those aspects touch the deepest side of personal securities. Data for AI systems should be collected, used, shared, archived and deleted in ways that are consistent with international law. Multi-stakeholder approach at the national or international level must be ensured throughout the life cycle of AI systems (Astobiza, et al., 2021; UNESCO, 2021). Data protection frameworks and any related mechanisms should take reference from international data protection principles and standards concerning the collection, use and disclosure of personal data and exercise of their rights by data subjects. The other part also involves informed consent in which algorithmic systems may impact privacy assessments. The design must always include societal and ethical considerations of data by maintaining such accountabilities (Chen, et al., 2021; UNESCO, 2021). That is done to totally protect matters of personal information so that the life cycle of the AI system may help people to stay in their privacies.

The sixth point is about human oversight and determination. This aspect has purposes to attribute ethical and legal responsibility for any stage of the life cycle of AI systems, inclusivity on public oversight, and the widened usages of AI. It is clearly stated that sometimes humans would choose to rely on AI systems for reasons of efficacy, but the decision to be in control of decision-making and acting must be in the hands of human beings (Sigfrids, et al., 2022; UNESCO, 2021). AI systems can never replace ultimate human responsibility and accountability. The aspect of the principle is interesting since people used to blame mechanical error for the sake of abandoning human responsibilities. This principle shows that human error is the main accusation needs to be done in order to determine the accentuations of AI in everyday life.

The seventh point is on transparency and explainability. Those points are essential

preconditions to ensure the respect, protection and promotion of human rights, fundamental freedoms and ethical principles. Transparency is necessary for relevant national and international liability regimes to work effectively (Bryndin, 2020; UNESCO, 2021). A lack of transparency could also undermine the possibility of effectively challenging decisions based on outcomes produced by AI systems and may thereby infringe the right to a fair trial and effective remedy. Narrowly, the indication of transparency in this case is related to the support towards democratic governance. Widely, transparency and explainability should always be appropriate to the context and impact including privacy, safety and security. The matter of explainability is that everything related to AI must be able to answer any question ethically. People could request explanatory information from the relevant AI actor or public sector institutions (UNESCO, 2021). In addition, individuals should be able to access the reasons for a decision affecting their rights and freedoms. Furthermore, socially, greater transparency contributes to more peaceful, just, democratic and inclusive societies. It allows for public scrutiny that can decrease corruption and discrimination, help detect and prevent negative impacts on human rights, and foster trust. Explainability may also refer to making intelligible and providing insight into the outcome of AI systems. The explainability of AI systems also refers to the understandability of the input, output and the functioning of each algorithmic building block and how it contributes to the outcome of the systems (Sigfrids, et al., 2022; UNESCO, 2021). The focus of explainability is the outcomes in which must always be open and accessible. Moreover, transparency and explainability relate closely to adequate responsibility and accountability measures, as well as to the trustworthiness of AI systems.

The eighth aspect is about responsibility and accountability. This part is needed to state the ethical and legal responsibilities in developing and using AI. The ethical responsibility and liability for the decisions on an AI system should always ultimately be attributable to AI actors corresponding to their role in the life cycle of the AI system (Bryndin, 2020; UNESCO, 2021). Both

technical and institutional designs should ensure auditability and traceability of AI systems to address any conflict with human rights norms and standards and threats to environmental and ecosystem well-being. The aspects of AI by mentioning it is about being listed in international law. By involving the AI, it is not a neutral without any conception at all. It is used by human beings and any responsibility is taken by the doers, not the machines (Bryndin, 2020; UNESCO, 2021). Therefore, accountability must also accompany such responsibility so that any kind of misunderstanding and even failure could be prevented from the beginning of the usage of the AI.

The ninth part is about awareness and literacy. AI should make people open their eyes that information and technology could always invade their lives. People may avoid the systems individually, but never structurally. Open and accessible education, civic engagement, digital skills and AI ethics training, and media and information literacy and training must always be promoted to gain more access and understandings of AI systems (Bryndin, 2020; UNESCO, 2021). Considering the existing linguistic, social, and cultural diversities may involve further and deeper effective public participation so that all members of society can take informed decisions about their use of AI systems and be protected from undue influence. The grounded point of AI in bringing more aspects of literacies are clear. That is grounded by the impacts of AI on human rights and access to rights, as well as on the environment and ecosystems.

The tenth aspect is multi-stakeholder and adaptive governance and collaboration. This one is more structural since it involves various powers to gain better benefits from AI. International law and national sovereignty must be respected in the use of data. Regulation for generating and passing data is permissible but only if the action regards respect for the right to privacy in accordance with international law and other human rights norms and standards (UNESCO, 2021). The benefits of AI should also be as adoption of open standards and interoperability to facilitate collaboration should be in good place by good persons. Indigenous Peoples

are also respected so that AI could not eliminate them or modernize them more. They must also be respected for the self-governance of their data.

The ten points of the principles above pinpoint understanding that AI is not merely about machine AI is about things that surround it, including data, privacy, governance, peace, and even democracy. It is needed to be regulated since AI as such advancements of technology and information may only work in secrecyes as its essence is to surpass human beings (UNESCO, 2021). Therefore, transparency is the main point here to cover more people accessible to the data without being used, forced, or even violated by the unruly behaviors of the actors of AI.

Ethical Consequentialism and Continuation of Utilitarianism

The streams of philosophy will never cease out matters of ethics. The idea in ethics is divided into two common perspectives. The first one is saying that ethics is quite deontological. This idea pinpoints indications that any doing intrinsically contains any of good or bad motive, purpose, and indication (Sinnott-Armstrong, 2019). A deed is considered good or bad because of common sense says so. If it is good, everyone will do it. If it is bad, it certainly must be totally avoided by any person. Intrinsically, the goodness of a deed is that if all people do that, it will be totally beneficial for the sake of many people. There is no formulation that shapes deontological ethics. Everyone already knows about it as every main consciousness as human being. In a way, it is so rigid and may create various problems of flexibility. In other ways, deontological ethics provide certainties in ethics that are firm in their main senses without any need to pay attention to other things that may surround the deed, person, or motivation.

The second is focused on matter of consequentialism as the main emphasis in this paper. Different from deontological system, consequentialism pays attention much on to what extent a deed may affect the prolonging situations of many people (Driver, 2020). In this case, the goodness of a deed is considered from the consequences resulted from it. It does not put any effort to understand the background. What is

totally needed is the impact that may be brought to the reality if such deed is done. Every deed being done is having consequences afterwards and those ones must be ethical. The ethical points are essential especially when any action could create best impact for more people.

There are three main principles in consequentialism. Those types represent how such character may apply any deed towards the other side. The first one is ethical egoism. This one correlates to the idea that the action being done by me will only affect myself. This one is quite selfish but is also quite common in realities (Sinnott-Armstrong, 2019). Most people will prioritize him or herself first before taking care of others' interests. This one is also rational since self is the closest impact that could be created once any action is done. The second one is group consequentialism. This one relies on the sameness between the doer and the impact. An action should only bring better consequences to those that someone may know, love, or have interest in it. This case is following such fellowship and matter of love when being applied. On a side, this aspect may enrich such understanding that consequentialism will tighten any closed relationship. However, it will also shape such result that the desired impact is quite shallow and may indicate such double standard in advance.

The third one is consequentialism for everyone. This one is more altruistic than the former two concepts (Driver, 2020). The one that needs to be impacted are totally the other persons even without any interest at all. This one is also named as utilitarianism. The main impact must accentuate higher purpose for all humans and all sentient beings as well. This is the other emphasis in this paper since this ethics brings various moral voices in various moral grounds either. The fundamental is similar to the former two aspects; it does not pay much attention to the action in itself, but it cares much to any widened impact that will be created furthermore.

Utilitarianism is the perspective that is quite popular in ethical points today. Though being formulated by John Stuart Mill several hundred years ago, this ethics is still creating good proportions in society (Driver, 2020). It is reflected

especially in the idea of Mill that actions should always create happiness for more people. If it is done then it is good. Vice versa, it is wrong if it lessens any happiness of many people. Consequently, that statement implies a slogan of "greatest happiness for the greatest number" in which all people must give more effort not to be selfish but to shape more altruistic ethics in everyday life (Anadza and Pasopati, 2021; Sinnott-Armstrong, 2019). There are two main kinds of utilitarianism. The first one is rule consequentialism. This one is based on following the rules of actions. There are some written or unwritten regulations that have guided people for a long time. Following the rules will make people be good since it will surely bring goodness towards more people (Eggleston, 2020). The second one is act consequentialism. This idea then underlines that every human being has an option to do good for the sake of other people. There is no obligation or duty to be good to others, but if something good is done then it will also create other goodness to one self. It prefers to work like in a domino effect in good ways (Hinman, 2012; Sinnott-Armstrong, 2019). One good action may result to goodness and provoke other people to do the same or even better for the wider sense of further awareness of any surrounding.

By taking points on consequentialism, the ethical consideration of any action is the consequences for everyone. There are some points that could be understood as the indicators of consequentialism. First, it shifts the idea from deontological points and pays more attention to the outcome than the source. Consequentialism takes path in underlining the goods of actions (Anadza and Pasopati, 2021; Eggleston, 2020). The consequences are being justified as those promote goodness for many people. Second, it is quite practical since any decision should always be accompanied with various considerations on the impacts of it. It does not stand alone as the deontological path. Third, the values are stated not in the action itself but the appreciations on the effects. Doing such action does not bring goodness at the same time (Eggleston, 2020; Sinnott-Armstrong, 2019). It will only come to realization if such impacts are regarded and fully considered.

Fourth, consequentialism does not think that the action itself contains goodness intrinsically. Furthermore, it only points to the simplified meanings of the effects in which contexts takes place. Fifth, consequentialism emphasizes more on the theory of right than theory of good. While theory of good resemble the proposition of good life in good action, theory of right underlines that any knowledge in good life means nothing if it is not realized in behavior in particular circumstances (Driver, 2020; Eggleston, 2020). The main idea is being right towards others without regarding the essential points of being good itself.

Sixth, consequentialism always considers which action that promotes the goods. This aspect pays more attention to the idea of calculation of realities. It is also useful to predict any outcome that will be realized if people do this or that action regarding wider societies (Anadza and Pasopati, 2021; Everett et al., 2018). Seventh, it pays more indications towards idea of being rational. Any action must be logical by considering the cost and benefit that comes and follows. The idea in this point is indeed related to the latter part rather than focusing on former part. Eighth, deontological ethics often attacks consequentialism by saying that paying attention to result will derogate the goodwill in the action itself. If it is bringing good for more people, even violence could be justified instantly. Therefore, utilitarianism tends to think that the data must be really exact so that the outcome could also be well predicted (Driver, 2020; Everett et al., 2018). Ninth, consequentialism is such clear and practical guidance in which any pain must be avoided. It is not to emphasize merely on pleasure as what hedonism used to think. It chooses to underline goodness or wrongness of any action by determination of the values of the results. The more benefits produced by the act, the more good or right the act will be (Everett et al., 2018; Hinman, 2012). Tenth, consequentialism provokes people to do good at their own goodwill. By doing so, the deepest good could come out to produce more impacts towards other people as well. People do good not because they have to but because they have options to do the best for the others. At this point, the fullest indications of altruism could be attained and realized as well.

The Senses of Consequentialism in Values and Principles of Recommendations on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence by UNESCO

The Recommendation on AI by UNESCO in 2021 indeed shows presuppositions of consequentialism in its values and principles. In its values, the indication is related to points of the conceptions known wider in the sense of the development of AI. The values involve the ways in which things must be kept to further guide the advancement of the machine (Heyder, et al, 2023; Astobiza, et al., 2021). By proposing values of human rights, the values of the Recommendations underline matter of human beings as the main indications to be started and followed in realm of AI. The principles work like a guidance that help people and actors of AI to understand more about various aspects in today's world. The machine is not just machine, but it may have purpose that could change any existing cultural values among societies (Bryndin, 2020; Heyder, et al, 2023). Therefore, the principles both limits the usage of AI from the inside and restricts it from the outside to make sure that any human rights are not violated.

By focusing on the consequences, the Recommendation underlines that anyone could gets involved and be the actors and users of AI. The machines are just intermediaries between humans and progress. Those work as tools that prolong humans' existence without derogating its main essence (Astobiza, et al., 2021; Heyder, et al, 2023). In this very case, consequentialism brings wider perceptions and presuppositions to the existing AI. The developments of AI are not merely advancements of the machines and automatons, but those could always change the way humans live their everyday life. It is similar to the COVID-19 that must be coped up with various instruments to prevent worse consequences. The virus indeed changed the way people live until now and somehow has made several changes on cultural language of the routines.

Consequentialism in the values and principles of the Recommendation is analyzed in this article by following ten indicators of that ethics. By following the indicators, the sense of utilitarianism could also be clearer to understand that the Recommendation is done to promote more

goodness for wider people worldwide out of any interpersonal conflict (Oktafiani, et al., 2023). In the values, the four ideas of respect, protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms and human dignity, environment and ecosystem flourishing, ensuring diversity and inclusiveness, and living in peaceful, just and interconnected societies clearly state matter of consequentialism (UNESCO, 2021). Though the values are quite firm as stated in deontological ideas, the implied indications are shown in matters of being in the result of any action.

The first value of human dignity underlines matter of practical aspects that needs to be appreciated through the considered actions. Human rights are nothing if not being applied and protected in everyday life. The goodness of them will only be understood better if the impacts are fully considered. The human dignity should also be known in its practical matters that will improve quality of life. In matter of AI, the practice of the Recommendation to go beyond any differentiation is a good point that demands such desired result (Bryndin, 2020; Astobiza, et al., 2021). AI should always appreciate any diversity of human beings. AI must also be in coherent with the openness towards any vulnerable people who really need the equities and equalities. Furthermore, matter of prioritization is so practical that contains impacts that will not only protect the essence of human dignity, but also enhance demand of life and its various completions (Bryndin, 2020; Astobiza, et al., 2021). The second value of environmental and ecosystem flourishing states more about consequentialism in perspectives of precautions. Indeed, precaution is matter of practicality that every human being must do this thing to keep the natural surroundings safe. This idea slowly rejects the attacks of deontological ethics towards consequentialism. While consequentialism is accused of doing violence to do any greater good, this Recommendation presupposes sustainability development as a tool to guide the advancements of AI (UNESCO, 2021). Reductions of carbon footprints, for example, is a practical matter that has nothing to do with deontological points. The main indication of consequentialism in this value is any advice to always stop irresponsible

exploitation towards deterioration of natural matters caused by the further developments of AI.

The third part of the values of this Recommendation is that AI must always pay attention to diversity and inclusiveness. In this part, any heterogeneous identity of human beings are appreciated through practical points of protections and promotions of lifestyle choices, beliefs, opinions, expressions or personal experiences (Pasopati, 2018; UNESCO, 2021). This one has also nothing to deal with deontological points. It surely involves matter of the desired result. To ensure that result, consequentialism shapes such guidance to prevent any action of homogenization among people. Any lack of necessary infrastructure and skills must always be minimized so that the result could reflect such higher reason and goodness of human beings and societies (Chubb, et al., 2021; Ong, 2021). The fourth part underlines more about living in peaceful, just, and interconnected societies. It is true that deontologically people will think that those ideas are the ones need the most. However, the source must always comply with any following development. Organic solidarities are the key concepts in this value that need to be desired to be the main outcome in advancements of AI. The realities of AI must always reflect the current realities of the people to promote more coexistence rather than to enhance more threats to come. The elimination of any equality surely could be done using deontological ideas, but indeed its flexibilities in understanding the main problems could only be attained by accentuating the process and its desired results through consequentialism.

In addition to the values, the principles of UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence are also closely related to consequentialism. The ideas are expanding from proportionality and do no harm, safety and security, fairness and non-discrimination, sustainability, right to privacy and data protection, human oversight and determination, transparency and explainability, responsibility and accountability, awareness and literacy, and also multi-stakeholder and adaptive governance and collaboration (UNESCO, 2021). Those aspects build such intertwinements between tensional matters in

everyday life, starting from essence vs existence, structure vs agent, to values vs realities, that may widen as well as enrich the ethical senses of AI and human beings in the future.

The first point of the principles is on proportionality and do no harm. This one is related to matter of consequentialism since it underlines the impact in which any decision will result to the others. It does not stand alone but being understood through any risk assessment (Astobiza, et al., 2021; Ong, 2021). The main idea is also to avoid any mass surveillance that could easily change the realities of wider societies. Being proportional should always be logical in the consequentialism sense. If things are not predicted precisely, the outcome could be so wild and out of control. Rigorous scientific foundation is also needed not to define people but to inject more rationalities out of any needed violence (Ibrahim, et al, 2023; Oktafiani, et al., 2023). The second point of the principle's points pout to the safety and security. Those ideas are also out of any kind of deontological definitions. Those matters move so flexibly that may work to create safe ecosystems for human and environmental conceptions. Besides, matters of human security is not about being deontological either. Rather than trying to follow the definitions, the principles of the Recommendation show any effort to bring more comfort in matter of security and safety to any human being (Astobiza, et al., 2021; Sigfrids, et al., 2022). People could not say that security matter is already defined and could not be overlooked anymore. In reality, the matters are so flexible that touch the deepest understandings of people according to their own experience throughout the world.

The third aspect of the principles speaks about fairness and non-discrimination that are full of humanity values. However, the values are not so rigid at all since humans are full of diversities, possibilities, and also considerations (Ong, 2021; Sigfrids, et al., 2022). If things are so fixed from the beginning to its end, it will never come up with suitable understandings to the real problems of realities. Instead, theory of right should accompany idea of being fair and without any discrimination so that various indicators could be covered further

alongside with the progress of the civilizations. Another example of promoting equity and equality between rural and urban areas is matter of focusing on the consequence rather than indicating the theory of good. This Recommendation also appreciates everyone's goodwill to do good to the society surrounding each person without any exception. Fairness is not about *das ding an sich*, but it walks together with human beings including the development of AI. Any fairness is not matter of definition, but understood in its particular meanings of everyday life (Astobiza, et al., 2021; Ibrahim, et al, 2023). The fourth aspect correlates more to any sustainability. Indeed, people need to sustain things in life without question. However, keeping that mere slogan will only focus on the fixed matter out of any synchronized matter of real problems. The problems are out there waiting to be solved. Besides, matter of competition has been intact with human beings and could not be easily forgotten. Only by considering other flexible matter then cooperation could be widely realized.

The fifth point is in privacy and data protection. This is for real is about consequentialism since the deontological point could only see in black and white about being totally individual or social at once. Being in privacy is stay in individual point without not being asocial. It is full of consideration in which logical points are contained extrinsically. The choice to open and close privacy is actually matter of personal experience. In many senses, people's choices could be totally different about approaching privacies. Therefore, accountabilities are always needed in this principle to ensure that privacy is totally considered in the following advancements of AI (Ong, 2021; Sigfrids, et al., 2022). The sixth point of the principles on human oversight and determination also comes up with idea of consequentialism that puts the process of ethical responsibility to the matter of the human beings. It is indeed related to matter of essential points of human beings, but the main emphasis is the outcome itself. If human is not responsible for what the figure has done, human will lose any essential idea of it as an autonomous creature (Bryndin, 2020). This aspect is deontological, but the main consideration is not the point of being responsible, but the condition if that responsibility

is hindered. It is not considered as an obligation, but it is rational to be applied in the everyday life of any human being.

The seventh indication of the principles is on transparency and accountability. The deontological point could not deal with those two since it only works in definitional matters. Being transparent and accountable are the unboxing moments of definitions. Those aspects push people to be more curious about everything rather than following what is defined as right or wrong. The more people ask, the more access they could have to various information (Bryndin, 2020; Ong, 2021). It is also applied in matters of AI that should be open to other stakeholders rather than being closed to some actors. This is also part of goodwill that emphasizes on theory of being right as the main outcome being calculated according to realities. Being trustworthy is not about being in definition, but being in process of understanding outcome of the deed. The eighth point of the principles underlines idea of responsibility and accountability. The responsibility is not matter of being intrinsic. The responsibility only appears when people use the advancement matters of AI (Wu, et al, 2020; Ong, 2021). In this case, the principles only pay attention to the matter of AI, not the philosophical understandings of being deontological. It is similar to being accountable that rationality is not the source, but a tool to prevent any misunderstanding and failure to come to the surface. Auditability and traceability of AI systems also show that the principles are intertwining each other in its values. It does not stand alone as a must, but it works like a network that keeps doing action of checks and balances.

The ninth indication is on awareness and literacy. This utilitarian aspect in that recommendation brings advantages to the existing spread of the usage of AI by not objectifying, undermining, and violating human rights. People need to be aware of this indication that people may not use AI arbitrarily that may derogate the existence of human rights (Bryndin, 2020; Wu, et al, 2020). Moral considerations could always be attained flexibly so that accessible information could also be understood by avoiding any undue influence. The tenth aspect is multi-stakeholder

and adaptive governance and collaboration. This idea tends to be more consequential since it focuses on the structural sense than the individual one. Indeed, it is not related to being deontological but being in process that later will shape various outcomes. Regulations must not be so strict but must be suitable to any progress including AI (Bryndin, 2020; Chubb, et al., 2021). This Recommendation in its detailed sectors indicates that norms and standards are also evolving. Interoperability should always be maximized rather than following certain fixations in the beginning.

The ten points of the principles show that things are always evolving. The advancements of AI are such examples that slowly change and shift humans' perspective from being manual to being automatic (Chubb, et al., 2021; Wu, et al, 2020). Any kind of coverage should always be accompanied with protection so that any desired outcome could be in control. This is the main point of consequentialism that underlines the good of practical actions. Various considerations on the impacts are the appreciations of the effects contextually.

Conclusion

The values of the Recommendation rely on four main points; respect, protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms and human dignity, environment and ecosystem flourishing, ensuring diversity and inclusiveness, and living in peaceful, just, and interconnected societies. The principles of the Recommendation expand on proportionality and do no harm, safety and security, fairness and non-discrimination, sustainability, right to privacy and data protection, human oversight and determination, transparency and explainability, responsibility and accountability, awareness and literacy, and also multi-stakeholder and adaptive governance and collaboration. Those aspects indeed are closely related to consequentialism in various ideas. It shifts the idea from deontological points and pays more attention to the practical and contextual outcome than the source. The Recommendation

also emphasizes more on the theory of right than a theory of good. The main idea is being right towards others without regarding the essential points of being good itself. Realities are always calculated, predicted, and realized regarding wider societies. The ideas of being logical and rational are prioritized either by accentuating clear and practical guidance. The more benefits produced by the act, the more good or right the act will be as being caused by goodwill in the matter of altruism sense.

References

- Abramoff, M. D., Tobey D., and Char, D. S. (2020), Lesson learned About Autonomous AI: Finding a Safe, Efficacious, and Ethical path through the Development Process, *American Journal of Ophthalmology*, 214, pp. 134-142.
- Anadza, H. and Pasopati, R. U., (2021), Globalization, Islam Nusantara, and Contemporary Character Empowerment, *Journal of Social, Humanity, and Education*.
- Astobiza, A. M., Toboso, M., Aparicio, M., Lopez, D. (2021), AI Ethics for Sustainable Development Goals, *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine*, pp. 66-71.
- Bryndin, E., (2020), Creative Communication Safe Ethical Artificial Intelligence in the Era of Technological Development, *Software Engineering*, 8 (3), pp. 13-23.
- Chen, J., Storchan, V., and Kurshan, E. (2021), Beyond Fairness Metrics: Roadblocks and Challenges for Ethical AI in Practice, *KDD MLF 2021*, pp. 1-6.
- Chubb, J., Missaoui, S., Concannon, S., Maloney, L., Walker, J. (2021), Interactive Storytelling for Children: A Case-study of Design and Development Considerations for Ethical Conversational AI, *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction*.
- Driver, J. L. (2020). Consequentialism, Virtue, and Character. In *The Oxford Handbook of Consequentialism*, Routledge.
- Eggleston, B. (2020). Consequentialism and Respect: Two Strategies for Justifying Act Utilitarianism. *Utilitas*, 32(1), 1–18.
- Everett, J., Faber, N., Savulescu J, & Crockett MJ. (2018). The costs of being consequentialist: Social inference from instrumental harm and impartial beneficence. *J Exp Soc Psychol.*, 79, 200–216.
- Heyder, T., Passlack, N., and Posegga, O., (2023), Ethical Management of Human-AI Interaction: Theory Development Review, *Journal of Strategic Information System*, 32, 1-50.
- Hinman, L. M. (2012). *Contemporary Moral Issues: Diversity and Consensus*. London: Routledge.
- Ibrahim, L. N., Calista, S. N., and Pasopati, R. U. (2023), The Relevance of God’s Voice in Conscience and Its Impact to Character Building, *Proceeding of International Conference on Religion, Science, ad Education*.
- Oktafiani, A. P., Ibrahim, L. N., Pujimahanani, C., and Pasopati, R. U., (2023), The Complexities of Interpersonal Conflicts as Reflected in Ernest Hemingway’s the Killers, *Tanda: Jurnal Kajian Budaya, Bahasa, dan Sastra*, 3 (1), pp. 29-41.
- Ong, D. C., (2021), An Ethical Framework for Guiding the Development of Affectively-Aware Artificial Intelligence, *Proceeding of 9th International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction (ACII)*.
- Pasopati, R. U., (2018), *Heterogenitas dan Heterologi: Pemikiran Michel de Certeau Tentang Kebebasan*, [Magister Thesis, Driyarkara School of Philosophy Jakarta, Indonesia].
- Sigfrids, A., Nieminen, M., Leikas, J., and Pikkuaho, P., (2022), How Should Public Administrations Foster the Ethical Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence? A Review of Proposals for Developing Governance of AI, *Frontiers in Human Dynamic*, 4, pp. 1-19.
- Sinnott-Armstrong, W. (2019). *Consequentialism*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/consequentialism/>
- UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. unesco.org/open
- Wu, W., Huang, T., Gong, K., (2020), Ethical Principle and Governance Technology Development of AI in China, *Engineering*, 6, pp. 302-309.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK