e-ISSN **3041-248X**

Philosophy and Governance

https://www.eu-scientists.com/index.php/fag

Philosophy of Responsibility in the Age of Technology: Between Anonymity and Control

Tetiana Svidlo [1]* ● Maryna Storozyk [2] ● Tetiana Bubon [2]

[1] *National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute" (Ukraine). Associate Professor at the Department of Philosophy, Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor.*

[2] *National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute" (Ukraine). Lecturer at the Department of Philosophy.*

* ***Corresponding Author,*** e-mail: t.svidlo@meta.ua

ARTICLE INFO

Research Article

DOI: 10.70651/3041-248X/2026.2.09

Received:
7 January 2026
Accepted:
9 February 2026
Published online:
13 February 2026

ABSTRACT

The relevance of the study is due to the rapid expansion of digital technologies, which leads to a fundamental transformation of classical ideas about individual and collective responsibility. The article aims to carry out a comprehensive socio-philosophical analysis of the processes of digitalization as a factor in the reformatting of subjectivity, freedom of speech and the ethical principles of urban space. The work is aimed at overcoming technological determinism by appealing to anthropological constants and classical philosophical heritage, in particular the ideas of J. G. Fichte, in the context of the challenges of algorithmic control and the ecological crisis. The study deconstructs the concept of "digitalization" as an ideological construct that imitates scientific objectivity and justifies the transition from passive models of liberal freedoms to a dynamic paradigm of communicative participation. It is proven that in the conditions of manipulative influence of large language models capable of influencing political beliefs through post-optimization methods, the philosophical ideas of J. G. Fichte should be considered as a tool for protecting the cognitive autonomy of the individual. An analysis of international experience, in particular the European AI Act (AI Act 2024), revealed the formation of a risk-oriented model of responsibility, where the transparency of algorithms and human supervision become mandatory regulatory guidelines. It is established that the digitalization of the sociosphere finds its constructive embodiment in the strategies of an intelligent city, where the introduction of biomorphic technologies and electromobility allows harmonizing the artificial and natural environment, minimizing the anthropogenic load on ecosystems. The study confirms that responsibility in the digital age is shifting from the plane of technical serviceability to the dimension of ethical subjectivity and legal accountability of algorithmic systems. The philosophy of technology is identified as a necessary methodological basis for designing a human-centered future, where digital tools serve as a means of strengthening freedom, not an instrument of alienation. Prospects for further exploration are related to the development of ethical protocols for the interaction of the subject with AI and the study of socio-psychological comfort in biomorphic urban structures.

KEYWORDS

ethics, J. G. Fichte, subjectivity, urbanism, philosophy of responsibility, philosophy of technology, digitalization, artificial intelligence (AI)

e-ISSN **3041-248X**

Філософія та управління

https://www.eu-scientists.com/index.php/fag

Філософія відповідальності в епоху технологій: між анонімністю та контролем

Тетяна М. Свідло [1*] ● Марина І. Сторожик [2] ● Тетяна В. Бубон [2]

[1] *Національний технічний університет України «Київський політехнічний інститут імені Ігоря Сікорського» (Україна). Доцент кафедри філософії, канд. філос. наук, доцент.*

[2] *Національний технічний університет України «Київський політехнічний інститут імені Ігоря Сікорського» (Україна). Викладач кафедри філософії.*

*** *Автор-кореспондент,*** e-mail: t.svidlo@meta.ua

СТАТТЯ

Дослідницька

DOI: 10.70651/3041-248X/2026.2.09

Отримана: 07.01.2026 р.
Прийнята: 09.02.2025 р.
Опублікована: 13.02.2026 р.

АНОТАЦІЯ

Актуальність дослідження зумовлена стрімкою експансією цифрових технологій, що призводить до фундаментальної трансформації класичних уявлень про індивідуальну та колективну відповідальність. Метою статті є здійснення комплексного соціально-філософського аналізу процесів цифровізації як чинника переформатування суб'єктності, свободи слова та етичних засад міського простору. Робота спрямована на подолання технологічного детермінізму через звернення до антропологічних констант та класичної філософської спадщини, зокрема ідей Й. Г. Фіхте у контексті викликів алгоритмічного контролю та екологічної кризи. У ході дослідження деконструйовано концепт «цифровізації» як ідеологічного конструкту, що імітує наукову об'єктивність, та обґрунтовано перехід від пасивних моделей ліберальних свобод до динамічної парадигми комунікативної партисипації. Доведено, що в умовах маніпулятивного впливу великих мовних моделей, здатних впливати на політичні переконання через методи постоптимізації, філософські ідеї Й. Г. Фіхте варто розглядати як інструмент захисту когнітивної автономії особистості. Аналіз міжнародного досвіду, зокрема європейського Акта про ШІ (AI Act 2024), виявив формування ризик-орієнтованої моделі відповідальності, де прозорість алгоритмів та людський нагляд стають обов'язковими нормативними орієнтирами. Встановлено, що цифровізація соціосфери знаходить своє конструктивне втілення у стратегіях інтелектуального міста, де впровадження біоморфних технологій та електромобільності дозволяє гармонізувати штучне та природне середовище, мінімізуючи антропогенне навантаження на екосистеми. Дослідження підтверджує, що відповідальність у цифрову епоху зміщується з площини технічної справності у вимір етичної суб'єктності та правової підзвітності алгоритмічних систем. Філософія технологій визначена як необхідна методологічна база для проєктування людиноцентричного майбутнього, де цифрові інструменти слугують засобом зміцнення свободи, а не інструментом відчуження. Перспективи подальших розвідок пов'язані з розробкою етичних протоколів взаємодії суб'єкта з ШІ та вивченням соціально-психологічного комфорту в біоморфних урбаністичних структурах.

КЛЮЧОВІ СЛОВА

етика, Й. Г. Фіхте, суб'єктність, урбаністика, філософія відповідальності, філософія технологій, цифровізація, штучний інтелект (ШІ).

1. Introduction

The rapid progress of digital technologies, artificial intelligence and global communications is changing not only social institutions, but also the very foundations of ideas about responsibility. In the digital space, the boundaries between private and public, individual and collective are gradually blurred, and the usual tools for ensuring responsibility are ineffective. Chairman of the Board of Directors of Google E. Schmidt, together with the founder and director of the Google Ideas Research Center J. Cohen, emphasizes in his book that the Internet is one of the few inventions that remains partially incomprehensible to humanity. What began as a tool for electronically transmitting data between two computers, the size of a room, has evolved into a ubiquitous and multifaceted means of expressing human energy and creativity. The Internet is constantly changing, becoming bigger and more complex every moment. It is a source of both enormous benefits and potentially destructive threats, and only now are we beginning to realize its impact on our world [15, p. 9].

The issue of the relationship between anonymity and control acquires special social significance in modern conditions. On the one hand, anonymity in the digital environment serves as an important tool for protecting privacy, promotes freedom of expression and creates conditions for open criticism of government structures. However, on the other hand, it can also become the basis for impunity, the spread of disinformation and manifestations of deviant behavior. At the same time, the growing trend towards increased digital control by state and corporate practices carries potential threats, including restrictions on civil liberties and violations of fundamental human rights. Today, a significant part of digital communication is carried out in a technological and informational and economic environment, which was impossible to even roughly imagine either in 1791, when the right to freedom of speech was enshrined in the First Amendment to the US Constitution, or in 1859, when John Stuart Mill outlined his ideas about freedom of expression in his work “On Freedom”. In this regard, it was impossible to predict what consequences the institutionalization of fundamental communicative freedoms, concentrated mainly around freedom of expression as a right to protection from state interference, could entail, given the specifics of modern digital realities [16, p. 167].

Artificial intelligence (AI) is one of the most significant phenomena of our time, according to O. Ivanova, which radically changes the ways of human interaction with technology and the environment. The rapid development of this field puts forward several new and complex tasks for philosophy, among which ethical challenges related to the preservation and rethinking of the anthropological dimension of human subjectivity are of particular importance. At the center of these ethical and ontological discourses is the human personality with its capacity for self-awareness, free will and moral responsibility [7, p. 72]. At the same time, algorithmic systems are increasingly penetrating various spheres of social activity, generating the risk of depersonalization of human subjectivity and blurring of its autonomous boundaries. Clarification of this problem requires a thorough philosophical dialogue between the humanistic and technological traditions, taking into account the strengthening of the influence of machine solutions. The anthropological dimension in this context aims to explore the essence of man as a subject of thinking, acting and reflection under the influence of the progress of AI. The question becomes urgent whether AI poses a threat to the identity of human subjectivity or, on the contrary, can serve as a means of its transformation. In this regard, the need to discuss the ethical principles of interaction between man and technology is becoming more and more relevant. Maintaining an anthropocentric position in a world that is rapidly transforming in the direction of technological reality requires close attention and comprehensive theoretical understanding.

2. Literature Review

The study of the transformation of responsibility in the context of digital expansion is an interdisciplinary problem encompassing classical philosophy, AI ethics, media philosophy and urban studies. The anthropological risks of AI and the blurring of the boundaries of human autonomy and human presence in the digital world in general have already become the subject of scientific attention by various scientists [7; 3; 16]. Many scientists are focused on issues related to the ethical use of modern technologies, in particular, AI and its impact on various spheres of life and on the person himself as a person and his identical dimensions [4; 9]. The eco-urban and socio-technological dimensions of responsibility are presented in the article by O. Levchenkov [11], where the philosophy of technology is considered as a normative basis for strategic planning of urban space. The issues of biomorphism,

environmental ethics and the relationship between artificial and natural environments in the context of the climate crisis are investigated by M. Orel [13]. Despite a considerable amount of scientific research, there is still a need for an integrated analysis that would connect classical interpretations of a person as a subject with modern mechanisms of algorithmic influence and new models of ethical use of AI, urban infrastructure planning, and virtualization of various spheres of life, which determines the relevance of this article.

3. Problem Statement

The purpose of this article is a socio-philosophical understanding of the transformation of the concept of responsibility in the context of the expansion of digital technologies, algorithmic control and exacerbation of environmental challenges of modern man-made society. An important stage of the work is the analysis of the structural shift in the understanding of freedom of speech in the digital age, which requires justification of the transition from the classical liberal model of the right to protection from interference to the socio-philosophical model of the right to participate in the construction of communication structures. Special attention is paid to the study of the manipulative potential of AI, in particular regarding the political views and preferences of voters. Why is the philosophical heritage of J. G. Fichte opposed to the autonomy of subjectivity and the value of the human personality. The study is aimed at theoretical substantiation of the role of the philosophy of technology and the concept of biomorphism as a normative basis for the design of intelligent urban space, which provides an ethically justified symbiosis of technological progress, social welfare and environmental safety of the sociosphere.

4. Methods and Materials

The methodological basis of the study is a complex of general philosophical and special scientific methods that allow to carry out an integrative analysis of technological transformations in socio-cultural and ethical dimensions. The leading method in the work is the hermeneutic method used to reinterpret the classical philosophical heritage in the context of modern digital realities. The use of the phenomenological approach made it possible to analyze the change in the structure of self-consciousness and identity of the subject in the conditions of algorithmic influence and digital anonymity. The empirical basis of the study is the results of current research on the manipulative potential of AI, as well as regulations related to digitalization. The analysis of the eco-urban aspect and the concept of biomorphism was carried out with the involvement of methods of the system approach and social ecology. The combination of these methods has provided multifaceted coverage of the issue of responsibility, from individual ethical choices to global regulatory regulation.

5. Results and Discussion

Today, social transformations are often united under the concept of digitalization. The first notable reaction to these changes is the emergence of new terms, theories and methodologies. The analysis of modern social transformations shows that most of them today are labeled with the term “digitalization” without an alternative. At first glance, such a large-scale technological shift requires the immediate creation of fundamentally new theoretical frameworks, concepts and research methods. From a purely technical point of view, digitization is the process of converting continuous signals into discrete ones, which is uninformative for humanitarian and socio-philosophical knowledge. Much more important is the social aspect of this process, which, despite its ubiquity, remains conceptually vague and devoid of a clear empirical essence. In our opinion, it is advisable to interpret the modern discourse around digitalization through the prism of organizational theories as a “rationalized myth”. Such myths reflect the expectations of the external environment: scientific and social institutions accept the attribute “digital” as a marker of modernity and legitimacy, often neglecting its real theoretical validity. In this context, digitalization appears more as an identity-forming heuristic that structures the political and scientific field, rather than as an independent research category [8]. Critical deconstruction allows us to change the focus of research: instead of chasing changing technological forms, we propose to focus on the constants of human communication and being. The digital changes we perceive are only an occasion to develop a deeper understanding of those fundamental mechanisms of subjectivity and

interaction that remain unchanged. It is this methodological step that allows us to turn to the classical philosophical heritage and current ethical challenges in the fields of freedom of speech, AI, and socio-ecological design of urban space in our further analysis.

M. Werner comprehends the contribution of philosophy in times of digital transformation using the example of freedom of speech. It is about how the digital transformation of communication causes a structural shift: from limitations in the ability to express to limitations in the ability to perceive, gradually exacerbating the problem of perception, which first began to take shape in the age of mass information. This shift exposes the problem of applying traditional, mostly defensive concepts of liberal freedom of speech to the new conditions of digital communication. This can give rise to difficulties, for example, in determining the role and responsibility of the so-called "intermediaries", i.e., platforms and channels that facilitate information exchange. The solution of such issues cannot depend only on the self-regulation of private entities. The role of philosophy in overcoming these challenges is largely determined by the fundamental socio-philosophical positions that underlie its approach to these issues. In contrast to K. Weber's libertarian understanding of digital freedom of speech as a purely freedom of information exchange, the idea of expanding the traditional protective aspect of freedom of speech by supplementing it with the rights to participate (ensuring equal access to communicative opportunities) and the rights to co-creation (joint participation in the construction of communication structures) is proposed. In this context, philosophy can play a meaningful role in accurately delineating such communicative rights within a complex media ecosystem and a multi-level network of functionally differentiated sub-publics, acting as a partner in interdisciplinary dialogue alongside other fields of knowledge. Analyzing digital transformation through the prism of the philosophy of responsibility, M. Werner comes to the conclusion that the traditional liberal model of freedom of speech as a "right to protection from interference" (Abwehrrecht) has exhausted its regulatory potential. Because in a situation where digital platforms are turning into "global arbiters of communication", a dangerous vacuum of responsibility arises. Under the conditions of anonymity of digital entities and private ownership of means of communication, control over the truth is actually delegated to algorithms. Therefore, responsibility in the digital age should be based on the reinterpretation of freedom: not just as the absence of censorship, but as the right to fair participation in the formation of communication structures [16, p.160, 177].

At the same time, algorithmic systems are increasingly penetrating various spheres of social activity, generating the risk of depersonalization of human subjectivity and blurring of its autonomous boundaries. Clarification of this problem requires a thorough philosophical dialogue between the humanistic and technological traditions, taking into account the strengthening of the influence of machine solutions. The anthropological dimension in this context aims to investigate the essence of the human being as a subject of thinking, acting and reflection under the influence of the progress of artificial intelligence. The question becomes urgent whether artificial intelligence poses a threat to the identity of human subjectivity or, on the contrary, can serve as a means of its transformation. In this regard, the need to discuss the ethical principles of interaction between man and technology is becoming more and more relevant. Maintaining an anthropocentric position in the world, which is rapidly transforming in the direction of technological reality, requires close attention and complex theoretical understanding [7, p. 72].

In the modern era, when digitalization processes radically transform social structures and affect individual identity, turning to classical philosophy opens up unexpected prospects for analyzing and comprehending these changes. The philosophy of Johann Gottlieb Fichte, a representative of German idealism, is an exceptional source for critical reflection on the challenges and opportunities that arise in the context of social digitalization. The thinker once noted in one of his speeches that a person cannot be inherited, sold, or donated, and could never become someone's property, because he belongs to himself and must remain so. In her innermost essence, there is a divine spark that elevates her above the animal world, making her a fellow citizen of the universe, the first link of which is God, that is, her conscience. It is this inner conscience that teaches a person to unconditionally and categorically desire one and not the other. She makes this decision completely freely, without outside coercion. If a person must obey the voice of his conscience, which is his absolute moral law, then external influence on him is impossible; It must be free from any interference. That is why no external force can prevail over its will. It must act in accordance with its internal law and remain free. The only source of power for a person is his internal law, and if he allows external authority to be imposed on him, he will contradict his own moral principle, erasing his humanity and slipping to the level of animals [2].

His reflections on the nature of self-awareness, intersubjectivity, and ethical responsibility provide valuable theoretical tools for analyzing issues related to individual identity in a digital world. In addition, judgments about the phenomenon of recognition and ethical responsibility contribute to a deep understanding of the processes of constituting the subject and the community. These ideas are of particular importance in today's world, where interaction is increasingly carried out through digital technologies. Digitalization processes, which are becoming more and more widespread, cause the transformation of social interactions, opening up both new opportunities and a number of challenges for society. Modern digital technologies contribute to the emergence of innovative forms of network communication and the creation of new communities. At the same time, raising questions about established notions of identity, recognition, and ethical behavior. The central thesis for J. G. Fichte about the need to be recognized by others as a fundamental condition for the formation of self-consciousness provides significant guidelines for analyzing the processes of digital identity formation and the role of social media platforms in modern society. His reasoning on mutual recognition and ethical responsibility within the community offers an important conceptual toolkit for understanding the ethical implications of digital interactions and shaping appropriate behavioral strategies in the digital reality. J. G. Fichte's commitment to education and cultural development as fundamental factors of social progress and ethical capacity opens up important prospects for analyzing the role of digitalization in modern education and cultural processes. His belief that individual freedom and ethical subjectivity are shaped and strengthened through education and active participation in cultural life is echoed in the current debate about democratizing access to knowledge through digital technologies. At the same time, it allows us to critically reflect on both the scale of opportunities and the risks associated with the implementation of digital models of education [10].

The rapid development of AI is fundamentally transforming the political arena, breaking the established rules of the game. Modern AI technology not only improves traditional tools of political practice but also offers fundamentally new opportunities for both strategic planning and, unfortunately, the manipulation of public opinion. At the present stage, AI functions as a powerful analytical tool that allows you to conduct research on social and political trends with unprecedented accuracy, predict election results, and optimize all aspects of communication with voters. AI has significant potential to transform electoral processes, contributing to their efficiency, transparency, and security. In particular, AI tools can be used to automate voter verification and improve the accuracy of vote counting, which can ultimately provide more reliable election results. However, along with these benefits, there are significant ethical risks, including data privacy violations, the spread of disinformation, manipulation of citizens' electoral behavior, and bias in AI algorithms. In order to realize the positive potential of AI and, at the same time, minimize possible risks, as I. Maine and E. Bukohwo argue, it is necessary to implement a reliable regulatory framework. It provides for the priority of principles such as transparency, fairness and accountability. The priority tasks in this case are to protect voters' personal data, overcome disinformation, and ensure that AI systems are acceptable. It is also crucial to develop clear ethical standards and offer citizens access to educational materials about AI technologies. A balanced and responsible approach to the use of AI can not only optimize the results of the electoral process, but also ensure that elections remain free, fair and transparent even in the age of digital transformations. In the future, it is expected to develop an ethical framework based on trust, as well as the introduction of blockchain technologies for verification and certification of electoral processes and documents, which will further strengthen their integrity [12, p. 3218].

However, the authors of the study "The levers of political persuasion with conversational artificial intelligence" found that AI chatbots can influence voters' political beliefs. The most effective means of increasing the persuasiveness of AI were post-learning methods and strategies through prompting, which increased the level of persuasion by 51% and 27%, respectively. These advantages often exceeded those achieved by substantially expanding the model. Personalization of arguments based on user data, on the other hand, had a relatively weak impact on AI's ability to persuade. The main factor that ensured a high level of persuasiveness was the density of information: the most successful models filled their arguments with a significant amount of factual data. At the same time, a disturbing trade-off between persuasiveness and accuracy was observed: the same approaches that contributed to the growth of persuasiveness, in particular post-learning and information-oriented prompting, often led to a decrease in the actual accuracy of the information created. The fundamental mechanism of AI-based political manipulation is content personalization, especially within social media. Modern algorithms are able to analyze every aspect of user activity, from search queries and preferences to online interactions.

Based on this detailed profile, AI technologies generate targeted advertising messages and informational materials that resonate with the specific preferences and beliefs of individual voters. The effectiveness of this approach increases exponentially due to the impact on the emotional level of communication, which goes beyond rational perception. This contributes to the establishment of a powerful emotional connection between the voter and the proposed ideas or policies. However, this process also has significant challenges. The use of AI in politics deepens existing social divisions, increasing the risk of social polarization. This is an important consequence that cannot be ignored in today's digital world. This study demonstrates that the persuasiveness of modern AI systems, as well as technologies of the near future, will be largely determined not so much by the scale of models or the level of personalization, but by the use of post-training methods and prompting techniques. It is these approaches that allow large language models (LLMs) to efficiently generate relevant information in dialogue mode. At the same time, the analysis revealed a potentially troubling trade-off: optimizing AI to achieve persuasiveness could lead to greater use of misleading or false information. These findings form an empirical framework for developers and policymakers, providing them with tools to identify and solve problems related to the application of AI for persuasion. In addition, it is critically important to implement preventive measures that would ensure a balance between the legitimate use of AI in the political sphere and minimizing the risks of manipulation and the spread of disinformation [5].

AI has significantly transformed modern election campaigns, significantly influencing their mechanism and strategies. Today, AI technologies are actively used to accurately target voters, create personalized content, optimize communication processes, and even, unfortunately, spread misinformation. In response to these challenges, many countries around the world are working on developing a legislative framework to regulate the use of AI in electoral procedures. For example, in the United States, there is currently no detailed legislative framework at the federal level that would regulate the use of AI. But several important initiatives have already been proposed:

- AI Transparency in Elections Act: Requires reporting on the use of AI in political advertising. Political messages containing images, audio, or video created or significantly modified using generative AI should have a clear warning about the use of such technologies. The draft law clarifies that content is considered to have been substantially altered if AI has been used to create or edit it significantly, except for minor changes, such as cropping or color correction;
- Protect Elections From Deceptive AI Act: Aims to prohibit the use of misleading AI-powered content in federal elections. If the voice or image of a federal candidate has been used in such material, he or she may file a civil lawsuit seeking to prohibit the further distribution of harmful content or seek damages, including compensation for legal fees and litigation;
- Honest Ads Act: aims to update election campaign finance legislation to reflect the new realities of digital advertising.

The implementation of the above initiatives is accompanied by significant challenges, such as the need to align them with freedom of speech and resistance from the tech industry. In addition, the jurisdiction of federal agencies such as the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and the Federal Election Commission (FEC) remains limited. Other countries are also developing and implementing relevant regulatory legislation. For example, Bill C-63 (2024) in Canada aims to combat the spread of harmful content on the Internet. It covers, in particular, the issue of deepfakes, which can affect the course of electoral processes or damage the reputation of individuals. And the Australian government has introduced a draft law to amend communications legislation called the Communications Legislation Amendment (Combatting, Misinformation and Disinformation) Bill 2024. However, the draft law caused a lot of criticism related to accusations of possible restrictions on freedom of speech [14].

The European Union has established itself as a global leader in shaping the regulatory framework for AI regulation. The AI Act (2024) structures AI systems according to risk levels and defines requirements for their security and transparency. AI systems used in electoral processes are classified as high-risk and require careful regulation. The EU's approach to AI regulation is distinguished by its comprehensiveness and proactivity, being an integral component of the overall digital development strategy. European regulators are focusing on preventing potential risks, not just responding to their consequences. The AI Act is an example of the EU's commitment to a comprehensive approach to regulation that covers all Member States [1].

The European AI Act aims to promote the responsible development and implementation of AI technologies within the EU. The document aims to minimize potential risks to the health, safety and rights of citizens. It sets clear requirements and responsibilities for developers and users of different

types of AI applications. Companies seeking to operate or continue their activities in the EU market are required to prepare to comply with the new rules. The AI Act provides for a single EU-wide legal framework based on a forward-looking definition of AI and a risk-based approach. Most AI systems, such as spam filters or video games with AI elements, do not have additional requirements. Companies can implement voluntary codes of conduct on their own. Certain systems, such as chatbots, must notify users that they are interacting with AI. Also, AI-generated content should be clearly labeled. While systems related to AI-based medical software or personnel selection solutions must meet stringent requirements. This includes risk mitigation measures, high-quality datasets, transparent information for users, ensuring human oversight, and other measures. It is unacceptable, according to the law, to use AI technologies for purposes such as social scoring of citizens by governments or companies. It is considered a threat to basic human rights and is strictly prohibited. The law laid the foundation for the ethical and safe development of AI in the EU countries, taking into account both its opportunities and risks [6].

In addition to paying attention to the philosophical understanding of the changes caused by the technological development of the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries related to freedom of speech and political risks, it is worth emphasizing the environmental aspects of such technologization. In today's international context, there is a clear trend of integrating environmental innovations with digital technologies in order to promote the sustainable development of urban areas. Of particular importance in this process is the field of electromobility, which is recognized as a fundamental direction for reducing the level of harmful emissions and creating a "green" energy infrastructure in the context of urbanization. The effectiveness of the implementation of the principles of electromobility is largely determined by the provision of appropriate methods of energy production and storage, as well as the possibility of integrating renewable energy sources into large-scale transport systems. Practical experience in installing environmentally friendly charging stations (CPRs) shows several positive consequences, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions, optimizing resource consumption and improving overall energy efficiency.

In addition to the obvious positive advantages, this also gives rise to new challenges related to the need to develop reliable electrical infrastructure, ensure cybersecurity in networks, and introduce standardization and proper technical support. All of the above necessitate coordinated actions on the part of government agencies and the corporate sector. The further development of the digital society is increasingly associated with the use of the powerful potential of AI. The approach to the mass use of AI for ecological and human-centered urbanization involves not only the automation of certain procedures, but also the formation of a qualitatively new approach to the organization and functioning of urban systems. The use of AI technologies to carry out high-precision analysis of huge data arrays in real time, which in turn contributes to a prompt response to social and environmental challenges. This process includes both the optimization of transport logistics to reduce environmental pollution and the introduction of smart energy management systems, which have the potential to significantly reduce the anthropogenic burden on ecosystems. An important element of this approach is the data that serves as the basis for their collection, processing and targeted use in the context of urban planning.

Within the framework of the smart city paradigm, which is based on data management, all components of the urban ecosystem, from transport infrastructure to utility systems, are integrated into a single digital information space. This helps to increase the transparency of management processes and makes it possible to more effectively assess and manage potential risks, in particular those of an environmental nature. However, along with the many advantages of such a transformation, there are also serious challenges. The issues of confidentiality and ethics are becoming more and more relevant, because the environment that is constantly monitored can limit the privacy of citizens and will require significant changes in legal regulation.

In the context of the philosophy of technology, researchers focus on the importance of integrating the technological aspect into the basis of philosophical research. This allows for a deeper understanding of societal transformations and their consequences. If earlier technology was perceived mainly as an applied science, today its impact goes far beyond these limits, encompassing significant anthropological and sociocultural aspects. For example, the philosophy of technology can not only contribute to a deeper conceptual understanding of technological progress but also lay a normative basis for the development of technological projects and strategic decision-making. This approach avoids the gap between theoretical philosophical discussion and the practical use of innovations, which often causes insufficient attention to ethical and environmental issues in the creation of new technologies [11, p. 133].

Given the modern pursuit of economic benefits and competitive advantage, representatives of global elites often resort to actions that degrade and destroy natural systems. Such interference significantly damages public health and threatens the planet's ecological integrity. O. Spengler once predicted a conflict between technology and culture, fearing that uncontrolled technological progress could lead to the destruction of cultural traditions. M. Heidegger also drew attention to the fundamental influence of technological progress, considering it as a force capable of significantly transforming human existence. K.–O. Apel emphasized that scientific achievements in the conditions of technological progress pose a serious ethical challenge for humanity, requiring collective solidarity and responsibility for the consequences of this development. Similar opinions were expressed by representatives of the humanistic direction of philosophy, such as A. Maslow, who called for the creation of a humanistic philosophy of biology, as well as R. Atfield, who laid the foundations of environmental ethics. These studies highlight the importance of rethinking human interaction with the environment and ethical responsibility for its condition. The contribution of the Chicago School of Sociology to the development of philosophical and social understanding of urban problems deserves special attention. Its researchers, who called themselves humanistic ecologists, emphasized that the artificial urban environment and natural landscapes are closely interconnected with social structures and affect the formation of a sense of comfort and well-being of urban residents. Modern Western researchers of biomorphism, including S. Bergen, T. Bitley, M. Cadenaso, P. Kindel, R. Costanza, P. Nieman, D. Friedli, study the relationship between living and artificial nature in the context of the aggravation of the environmental crisis, climate change, and natural disasters, which are aggravated by digitalization and virtualization of life processes. Thus, the topic of biomorphism is gradually gaining popularity in the humanitarian sphere, but there is still a lack of a socio-philosophical approach for a deeper understanding of this phenomenon. There is also a lack of integration of theoretical developments with practical analysis of urban everyday life [13, p. 160-162]. The philosophy of the city should be aimed at interaction with other areas of empirical urban planning, such as the theory of the city. Thanks to this, it not only adopts new knowledge but also actively contributes to the development of other disciplines, offering primarily conceptual analysis and perspectives.

6. Conclusions

The perception of digital transformation as an ideological construct that imitates scientific objectivity allows us to go beyond purely technological determinism and focus on existential constants that determine the essence of human interaction, regardless of the tools for its implementation. The classical concepts of liberal freedom, focused on passive protection against interference, turn out to be relevant only partially, giving way to a dynamic model of communicative participation, which involves the active involvement of the subject in the construction of network architecture and overcoming the algorithmic monopoly on truth. In our opinion, the intellectual heritage of German idealism is of particular importance, in particular Ficht's ideas about the self-worth of the "I" and the role of intersubjective recognition, which serve as a reliable conceptual shield against the leveling of the personality in the conditions of total dataification. The empirically confirmed impact of dialogue systems on voters' beliefs actualizes the need for a transition to proactive regulatory regulation, embodied in modern international acts based on the priority of human oversight and transparency of machine decisions. Finally, the architectonics of the future sociosphere is seen in the implementation of biomorphic strategies for urban development, where digital tools and environmental innovations are subordinated to humanistic guidelines, transforming the philosophy of technology from an abstract discipline into an effective methodological framework for creating a safe and harmonious living space. Further scientific research in this direction should focus on the empirical verification of ethical protocols for human interaction with generative AI models, in particular in terms of their impact on the cognitive autonomy of the individual.

References

1. European Parliament and Council of the European Union. (2024). *Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)*. EUR-Lex. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj/eng

2. Fichte, J. G. (n.d.). Zurückforderung der Denkfreiheit [Reclaiming freedom of thought]. Zeno.org. http://www.zeno.org/Philosophie/M/Fichte,+Johann+Gottlieb/Zur%C3%BCckforderung+der+Denkfreiheit/Rede
3. Frank, M., Geier, T., Hornberg, S., Machold, C., Otterspeer, L., Singer-Brodowski, M., & Stošić, P. (2023). *Grenzen auflösen – Grenzen ziehen: Grenzbearbeitungen zwischen Erziehungswissenschaft, Politik und Gesellschaft*. Opladen, Berlin, Toronto.
4. Gesnot, R. (2025). *The impact of artificial intelligence on human thought*. Cornell University. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2508.16628
5. Hackenburg, K., Tappin, B. M., Hewitt, L., Saunders, E., Black, S., Lin, H., Fist, C., Margetts, H., Rand, D. G., & Summerfield, C. (2025, July 18). The levers of political persuasion with conversational artificial intelligence. *Science, 390*(6777). https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2507.13919
6. Holodnytskyi, E. (2024, August 1). Z serpnia nabuv chynnosti AI Act – pershyi zakon pro shtuchnyi intelekt v YeS [The AI Act, the first artificial intelligence law in the EU, came into force in August]. *International Advisers Association*. https://iaa.international/publication/z-serpnia-nabuv-chinnosti-ai-act--pershii-zakon-pro-shtuchnii-intelekt-v-es (in Ukrainian)
7. Ivanova, O. (2024). Etychni vyklyky shtuchnoho intelektu: Antropolohichnyi vymir liudskoi subiektnosti [Ethical challenges of artificial intelligence: An anthropological dimension of human subjectivity]. *Actual Problems of Philosophy and Sociology*, (51), 72–76. https://doi.org/10.32782/apfs.v051.2024.12 https://doi.org/10.32782/apfs.v051.2024.12 (in Ukrainian)
8. Jünger, J., & Schade, H. (2018). Liegt die Zukunft der Kommunikationswissenschaft in der Vergangenheit? Ein Plädoyer für Kontinuität statt Veränderung bei der Analyse von Digitalisierung. *Publizistik*, (63), 497–512. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11616-018-0457-6
9. Kruip, G., Späth, E., & Sabater, A. (2025). Ethical aspects of research on AI-based social assessment. In P. Ahrweiler (Ed.), *Participatory artificial intelligence in public social services*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-71678-2_3
10. Leiterer, C. (2025). Fichtes Philosophie im Kontext der sozialen Digitalisierung: Selbstbewusstsein, Anerkennung und ethische Handlungsfähigkeit. In M. Opielka & C. Erfurth (Eds.), *Soziale Digitalisierung: Perspektiven der Sozialpolitik*. Springer VS. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-46328-1_24
11. Levchenkov, E. (2025). Filosofiia tekhnolohii ta ekolohichna svidomist u dobu rozvytku smart-suspilstva [Philosophy of technology and environmental awareness in the age of smart society]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriia: Filosofsko-politychni studii*, (59), 130–136. https://doi.org/10.30970/PPS.2025.59.14 (in Ukrainian)
12. Maine, I., & Bukohwo, E. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence, ethical implications and technologies on the electoral process. *E-Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, 5*(16), 3211–3219. https://doi.org/10.38159/ehass.202451641
13. Orel, A. (2022). Biomorfnyi urbanizm. Filosofiia rozumnoho mista [Biomorphic urbanism: Philosophy of the smart city]. *Mulliversum. Philosophical Almanac, 1*(175), 158–176. https://doi.org/10.35423/2078-8142.2022.1.1.11 (in Ukrainian)
14. Petriv, O. (2025, April 25). Rehuliuvannia vykorystannia ShI u vyborchykh protsesakh [Regulation of the use of AI in electoral processes]. *Center for Democracy and Rule of Law*. https://cedem.org.ua/analytics/ai-vybory/ (in Ukrainian)
15. Schmidt, E., & Cohen, J. (2015). *Novyi tsyfrovyi svit. Yak tekhnolohii zminiuiut derzhavu, biznes i nashe zhyttia* [The new digital world: How technology is changing the state, business and our lives]. Litopys. (in Ukrainian)
16. Werner, M. (2024). Redefreiheit, Digitalisierung und die Rolle der Philosophie. In R. Adolphi, S. Alpsancar, S. Hahn, & M. Kettner (Eds.), *Philosophische Digitalisierungsforschung: Verantwortung, Verständigung, Vernunft, Macht* (pp. 155–196). transcript Verlag. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783839474976-006