Recibido: 20/4/2024
Aceptado: 05/5/2024

CLÍO: Revista de Revista de Historia, Ciencias Humanas y pensamiento crítico
Año 4, Núm 8. Julio/Diciembre (2024)
PP. 306-320. Provincia de Pontevedra - España

Nature and purpose of artificial intelligence. Political, legal, and economic challenges in the 21st century

Asma Jadallah Khasawneh*, Iryna Mihus, Nataliia Svyrydiuk***, Zinaida Zhyvko******

ABSTRACT

The notion of nature and purpose of artificial intelligence (AI) refers us to an ontological analysis of this technological phenomenon, in full development in the 21st century, that is, to the search for the meaning of AI in general in the structure of the sensible experience of the world, as it is presented in consciousness, which may reveal the being and essence of the AI entity, beyond the contingent factors that identify it. By means of a methodology close to the Socratic maieutic that asks questions in its dialogic attempt to understand transcendental phenomena, in its double cultural and epistemological dimension, the objective of this essay is to interpret the political, juridical and economic challenges that are proper to the nature of artificial intelligence, in the second decade of the 21st century, an era characterized by the predominance of new information and communication technologies in all social relations. It is concluded that soon AI can radically modify human societies, which demands from public policy makers and legislative bodies in general, the ability to regulate the conditions of use and development of this technology to avoid undesirable scenarios.

Keywords: Ontology of artificial intelligence; New technological realities; Political challenges; Risks; Economic security.

Naturaleza y finalidad de la inteligencia artificial. Retos políticos, jurídicos y económicos en el siglo XXI

RESUMEN

La noción de naturaleza y fines de la inteligencia artificial IA nos remite a un análisis ontológico de este fenómeno tecnológico, en pleno desarrollo en el siglo XXI, es decir, a la búsqueda del significado de la IA en general en la estructura de la experiencia sensible del mundo, tal como se presenta en la conciencia, lo que podrá revelar el ser y esencia del ente IA, más allá de los factores contingentes que le identifican. Mediante una metodología próxima a la mayéutica socrática que hace preguntas en su intento dialógico por entender los fenómenos trascendentales, en su doble dimensión cultural y epistemológica, el objetivo de este ensayo

* Department of History, College of Arts and Languages, Jadara University, Irbid, Jordan. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4460-0257. Email: akhasawneh@jadara.edu.jo

** Director, Scientific Center of Innovative Research, Estonia. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6939-9097. Email: irynamihus@gmail.com

*** Odesa State University of Internal Affairs, National Academy of the Security Service of Ukraine, Ukraine. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9772-1119. Email: S_N_P_@ukr.net

**** Department of Economics and Management, Academy of Economics and Pedagogy, Prague, Czech Republic. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4045-669X. Email: zinaukraine@gmail.com

consiste en interpretar los desafíos políticos, jurídicos y económicos que son propios de la naturaleza de la inteligencia artificial, en la segunda década del siglo XXI, época caracterizada por el predominio de las nuevas tecnologías de la información y comunicación en todas las relaciones sociales. Se concluye que en el futuro próximo la IA puede modificar radicalmente a las sociedades humanas, lo que demanda en los hacedores de políticas públicas y organismos legislativos en general, la capacidad de regular las condiciones de uso y desarrollo de esta tecnología para evitar escenarios indeseados.

Palabras clave: ontología de la inteligencia artificial; nuevas realidades tecnologías; desafíos políticos; riesgos; seguridad económica.

Introduction

The title of this article may seem controversial and contradictory at first; Controversial, because if we understand artificial intelligence AI as a technology that combines algorithms to create machines (tangible and/or software) with human-like capabilities, such as reasoning, learning and relatively autonomous decision making, it is clear that, at least in terms of existentialist or medieval philosophy, it is an entity that has no nature, but a cultural essence, at least in terms of existentialist or medieval philosophy, it is an entity that has no nature, but a cultural essence, hence one cannot speak assertively of the nature of AI as one speaks, for example, of human nature *stricto sensu*, a situation from which emanates the intrinsically polemical character of the essay.

Nature and essence, sometimes synonymous concepts and sometimes with a particular meaning depending on the author consulted (Ferrater, 2004), have been key concepts in metaphysical philosophy since classical antiquity. In the words of author Marcos, ancient and medieval philosophers: "...assumed as their own task the investigation of the invariant elements that condition and make human existence possible, of the essential features that make us precisely human and not anything else" (2010, p. 02) (emphasis added). Thus, the notion of nature alludes to two categories of ontology, on the one hand, the invariant elements of a being, that is, its identity, and on the other hand, the essential aspects that define the universal attributes of that being, not inductively, but rather deductively, through semantic premises such as: human beings are intelligent by nature.

In this order of ideas, a lapsed definition of essence can then allow, at least under certain textual and contextual conditions susceptible to the hermeneutic gaze, to suppose that AI has an essence that can be described or interpreted in the structure of the sensible experience of the world, as it presents itself to the consciousness of the cognizing subject that is part of an intelligible world. It is therefore appropriate to ask then how can the nation of essence or nature of AI be understood in the context of the digital revolution proper to the 21st century? Simply, by revealing not its nature, because it is not a metaphysical entity, but rather a technological, instrumental, and cultural one; what is at issue here then is to be able to identify its essence, that is, its universal purposes and its raison d'être in today's world of life, which undoubtedly leads us to a sort of teleological and ontological examination.

As already stated in the abstract, the aim of this essay is to interpret the political, legal, and economic challenges that are characteristic of the nature of artificial intelligence in the second decade of the 21st century, an era characterized by the predominance of new information and communication technologies ICT in all social and inter-subjective relations. This objective of research and reflection can also be expressed in the question by way of formulation of the theme-problem: What are the main political, legal, and economic challenges that are characteristic of the essence of AI, for human civilizations in the 21st century? Obviously, there is no simple or univocal answer to this question. The construction of a coherent answer to this and similar questions on the pressing issue of AI was the main motivation for this essay.

Moreover, the development of this research was encouraged by overcoming a scholarly and fossilized conception of ontology as a part of metaphysical philosophy in charge of the study of reality and, by extension, of its constituent entities and phenomena, as they present themselves to consciousness and as an objective and subjective continuum. For the authors of this research, ontology can undoubtedly be used in a responsible way to address issues of general interest such as AI and not only intricate philosophical questions that only matter to specialists in this area of knowledge.

This essay is divided into 5 sections: in the first, the main theoretical references that configured our vision of AI as a material and symbolic entity are shown; in the second, the methodological and gnoseological foundations that allowed us to carry out this essay are described; in the third section, the main results of the ontological analysis of AI are discussed; in the fourth, the conclusions and recommendations that emerge from this case study are arrived at. Finally, the bibliographical references consulted are shown.

1. Theoretical references that allow to configure a broad and flexible vision of ontology in the framework of AI studies

A web review of scientific articles published in high impact journals in English and Spanish shows that ontological analysis can be applied to different fields of study, such as physics, pedagogy, or epistemology. For example, in the study by Hoyos and Pocovi (2020), ontological analysis is used even in the domains of electromagnetics: "In this paper we present the analysis... of the concept of electromagnetic induction in order to provide a guide for the design of a didactic proposal focused on the nature of this concept and its relativistic character" (p. 38).

In the same eclectic order that puts ontology to the test, which could scandalize orthodox academics of philosophy, in the research of Medina and Quiroz (2017) ontology is used creatively in a hermeneutic study of school texts related to natural sciences and biology. For these researchers, it is clear that: "Scientific knowledge uses a conceptual language supported by a materialistic ontology, most philosophers and historians of science agree that the development of scientific knowledge can be understood by the conceptual change of its theories" (p, 3759), which among other things shows that ontology is a concept with a dual essential, which can go from metaphysics to the materialism of Western science of modernity.

Another interesting example that became a valid reference for this research was the work of Colella (2016), for whom, at least philosophically, education is also susceptible to ontological analysis that seeks to decipher its true being. Beyond its particularities, the sources consulted allow us to reach three general conclusions about the search for the nature or differential essence of entities (that which is existing):

1. Every ontological analysis is at the same time teleological because it assumes that the essence of entities is intimately associated with their ultimate purpose, or with those attributes that define their identity.
2. Ontological analysis, beyond its philosophical rigor, constitutes a heuristic tool for the understanding of the experience of the real, useful for different fields of knowledge and disciplines that go beyond the limits of the human and social sciences.
3. There is no standard protocol for using ontology in an adequate way; everything will ultimately depend on the creative capacity of the cognitive subjects, their philosophical inclinations, or their training and professional performance.

Having clarified the above, one must then ask, in instrumental terms, how can we define the essential purposes of AI? To which one can tentatively answer, the purposes of AI include automating processes, improving efficiency and productivity, and making informed decisions. In business, for example, AI enables employees to focus on more strategic and creative tasks, improving the customer experience and reducing human error. In addition, AI has the potential to drive global economic growth and contribute to the creation of fairer and more sustainable systems (Arbeláez-Campillo, Villasmil and Rojas-Bahamón, 2021).

AI has then two types of purposes that dialectically configure its essence: on the one hand, the particular purposes that each form of AI acquires according to its field of performance; on the other hand, and this is the most transcendental, AI seems not to be, at least at this historical moment, an autonomous form of intelligence, but more an instrumental complement to the intellectual capacity of the human person designed to quickly and rationally solve different issues, which may include from voice recognition and the demonstration of mathematical theorems, to the "creation of art" and the autonomous driving of vehicles. For these reasons, as reviewed by López de Mántaras (2018), AI is classified into two main types:

- Weak AI: Designed to perform specific tasks in the service of humanity.
- Superior AI: A hypothetical AI that could surpass human capabilities in all areas, which configures different scenarios ranging from transhumanism to the "domination and control of humanity" by non-human entities, with will of power and consciousness about their situation in the world, as indicated by science fiction in film productions such as: The Exterminated, I Robot or Ex machina, among others.

In a hypothetical context in which AI, together with genetic engineering and nanorobotics, end up modifying the human person, in its essence and universal existence, Fukuyama rightly asks: "If we begin to transform ourselves into something superior, what rights will these improved creatures claim, and what rights will they possess in comparison with those left behind?" (2004, p. 42). It is clear then, that not everything that has to do with the development of AI, is good, useful, or uplifting, there is an urgent need for a critical academic look at the essence of this phenomenon that can identify in advance the legal, political, and economic challenges that its widespread use will bring to humanity, without discarding its benefits and opportunities.

2. Epistemological and methodological considerations

The neopositivist or logical empiricist view of the social sciences, until recently hegemonic, has undervalued the essay as a genre of no great academic or scientific significance due to its discursive freedom and speculative nature. However, since the seventies of the twentieth century, a renewed postmodern and constructivist look has been gradually taking shape that presages the emergence of a new science, which, according to Martínez (2009), will be able to recognize without major complexes the subjective dimension of all knowledge, therefore, the current epistemology has been able to achieve a new and more complex approach to science, which, according to Martínez (2009), will be able to recognize without major complexes the subjective dimension of all knowledge:

> Current epistemology has been achieving a series of goals that can already form a set of unpronounceable postulates, such as the following: every observation is relative to the observer's point of view (Einstein); every observation is made from a theory (Hanson); every observation affects the observed phenomenon (Heisenberg); there are no facts, interpretation (Nietzsche); we are condemned to meaning (Merleau-Ponty). No consistent language can contain the necessary means to define its own semantics (Tarski); no science is capable of scientifically demonstrating its own basis (Descartes)... (Martínez, 2009, p. 15).

This extensive quotation shows the postulates that make possible the construction of a new scientific rationality that, at least in the domains of the social and human sciences, recognizes that all possible objectivity requires, in principle, to assume and recognize one's own subjectivity, no longer as a bias that interrupts the epistemic process of the search for truth, but, rather, as an ideographic interpretative model that gives sense and meaning to the phenomena presented to consciousness, a model that is a fundamental part of the intellectual apparatus that identifies human nature in its relationship with the material and symbolic entities of the world in which it unfolds ontologically, being and doing.

The post-positivist and post-structuralist position of science should not be confused with an a priori justification of all subjective experiences in the arduous process of knowledge production, which would be tantamount to making room for pseudoscience. Simply, what is at issue here is to recognize the essay, together with other literary, historiographic and philosophical knowledge, as a valid genre that combines on equal terms, creativity and the

free association of ideas, with rigor in the handling and interpretation of the documentary sources selected in this work.

For its part, Socratic maieutic refers to the dialogical-philosophical research method par excellence. Clarifying things, for González and López (2016), maieutic is a method based on intersubjective dialogue in which one of the interlocutors positions himself in not knowing and, from this position of "epistemic humility", asks a set of rational questions that allegorically recall the work of labor, since it seeks to make the questioned subject aware of the limitations and contradictions of his own arguments, as a sufficient and necessary condition to access the truth.

> The Socratic "not knowing" is the only element that in the end remains to the interlocutor in the dialogical activity. The most accessible knowledge consists in the experience of not knowing anything. Thus, Socrates becomes the bearer of a lapidary revelation through which one moves from the darkness of certainties to the lucidity of uncertainty. (González and López, 2016, p. 29).

From the point of view of the authors of this research, when maieutic is applied to written texts, it then becomes hermeneutics and consequently seeks to question a text in order to reconstruct the symbols and signs that allow us to understand what the authors say or even what they hide in the production of their text, always conditioned by the burden of the historical and cultural horizon of the context in which they live or lived. In this sense, to interpret a text adequately, that is, without distorting its true sense and meaning implies two basic conditions: first, to have the phenomenological awareness of one's own biases and conditioning, to achieve the *epoché* of not-knowing; second, to know the contextual symbolic system that serves as a material basis for the interpreted text or message (Gadamer, 2004).

3. Nature and purposes of artificial intelligence. Political, legal, and economic challenges in the 21st century: Analytic perspective

3.1. Political challenges

The political system is the directional system of a society because it concentrates in its being the four basic factors for the maintenance and reproduction of the established order, that is, following Vallès (2000): (a) the management of social conflict; (b) the administration of the material and symbolic resources of the community; (c) territorial organization of the polis or the community and, we add; (d) the articulation of power relations between the ruling elite with the other elites, near or far, and the civil society it claims to serve democratically, with all that this may come to mean in terms of power, knowledge and technology.

In this context, AI poses significant challenges to world order and stability. The ability of machines to learn and improve themselves could lead to a technological singularity, where they could hypothetically surpass human intelligence, generating uncertainty about the control and governance of these technologies. Moreover, digitization and AI could reconfigure political relations, reducing the space for leadership and participation of individuals and communities, however, this technocratic vision may prove to be overly alarmist and fanciful (Giraldi, 2019).

In fact, it is not unreasonable to imagine a near future where the main political decisions of a community, in the sense that Vallès (2000) refers to it, will be taken under the permanent guidance of advanced forms of AI, with human supervision; Let us think, for example, of algorithms that have the capacity to handle multidimensional data in real time in matters of national defense, public health, public safety, administration of justice and macroeconomics, among others, and convert this information into political decisions, legal rulings, rational plans and projects, with a capacity that surpasses traditional decision-makers and policy-makers. Even more, it is even possible that this political and legal function of AI can occur completely autonomously, with minimal human supervision (strong AI) (López de Mántaras (2018).

No one can know for certain what the outcome of AI will be in the coming decades; at most, certain prospective analyses can be made that foreshadow possible future trends in the use, attributes, and general behavior of AI in advanced societies that are already experiencing the cultural imprint of the so-called digital revolution. As for the scope and meaning of the digital revolution, it should be added that broadly speaking:

> We are evolving towards a hyperconnected and intelligent world and, at the same time, much more global. And the impact of this revolution, as we are already seeing, has an incomparable scope to any of those previously experienced, driving political, economic, and social changes at an accelerated pace. (Fundación CEDE, 2023, p. 05).

In this context of precipitous change:

> ICTs play a relevant role in the digitization of the economy, since without the technological innovation they generate, such digitization would be unthinkable. In fact, this wave of digitalization opens enormous opportunities for growth for all sectors of the economy and society, and in particular, new opportunities for business and job creation. (Fundación CEDE, 2023, p. 05)

Because of its complex nature, AI represents a political challenge for all societies embracing the digital revolution with its lights and shadows. In this thread, the challenge will increase as the use of AI is implemented in different activities, such as: economy, security, health, education, and entertainment, as it is already happening. In particular, the main political challenge for public policy makers lies in deciphering the essence and purpose of AI and creating a political and regulatory framework that guarantees that AI will be always used appropriately by all social actors, economic agents, and political subjects of power, without undermining the imminent dignity of the human person and, why not, the dignity of other higher forms of life (Nussbaum, 2012).

However, each society has before it the historical responsibility to create its own legal and political devices that guarantee, to the extent technically possible, that AI does not become a collective problem for its interests, needs and aspirations as a collective unit imbricated in technology. In this particular, we think, together with Arbeláez-Campillo et al. (2021), that three general positions on AI should be recognized as a requirement for developing successful public policies to regulate its development: first, an excessively benevolent position,

which assumes that AI is a completely beneficial phenomenon; second, an excessively critical position that maximizes the negative and harmful aspects of this technology and; third, a balanced position that fairly values the opportunities and threats intrinsic to AI, undoubtedly, this is the most intelligent view.

3.2. Legal challenges

As suggested by Parra and Concha (2021), in the normative dimension, closely related to politics, the intensive use of AI has given rise to new legal relationships not contemplated in current and traditional normative frameworks. Emerging in the process is a set of real or imaginary problems that include liability for the actions of intelligent machines and the protection of human rights in the age of algorithms, however fictional these issues may now seem. In the global order, everything indicates that it is necessary to develop a flexible and dynamic regulatory system that addresses these challenges and guarantees human self-determination, beyond the particularities of the regulatory bodies of each country, in fact, Isaac Asimov's three laws of Robotics can serve as a guide in the legislative act on AI.

> First Law
>
> A robot will not harm a human being, nor by inaction allow a human being to be harmed.
>
> Second Law
>
> A robot shall comply with orders given by human beings, except for those that conflict with the first law.
>
> Third Law
>
> A robot must protect its own existence to the extent that this protection does not conflict with the first or the second law. (Asimov, 2008, p. 16)

Is it too hasty to speak of the possible criminal liability of intelligent machines in the commission of crimes as if these entities were subjects of law? Can we credibly imagine the configuration of a socio-technological scenario in which AI may constitute an obstacle to the enjoyment of the fundamental rights of the human person? Well, before attempting to answer these legal questions, it is worth analyzing the following sample of news or opinions that abound in the press of greater disclosure: "A security report revealed that Artificial Intelligence could facilitate massive destruction attacks" (Marín, 2024) published by Infobae; or this other: "Preventing AI nuclear Armageddon" (Parke, 2023), finally, "United States requires China and Russia to declare that artificial intelligence will not control nuclear weapons" (Escenario Mundial , 2024).

It is clear that in the geopolitical scenario of the 21st century it is not unreasonable to think that AI could be a pernicious instrument with a superlative potential to inflict harm to humanity, of course, at least now this possible harm would not be the deliberate result of the will or the essence of AI, because it is an entity without a will of its own, but the consequence of an instrumental use by groups or even States that could act outside international

legality to achieve their strategic goals and objectives, without a clear ethical framework and regardless of the probable consequences of their actions, For these reasons, a hegemonic power such as the United States of America proposes the creation of a treaty to prevent AI from managing the use of nuclear weapons:

> In a call to strengthen security measures around nuclear weaponry, a senior U.S. official urged China and Russia to join the stance taken by the United States, France, and Britain, who have established a "clear and firm commitment" that only humans, and never artificial intelligence (AI), will make decisions on the deployment of these weapons of mass destruction. (World Scenario, 2024, par. 02)

Incluso si se imagina un mundo ideal donde la IA tenga una naturaleza benévola inmutable, hay ciertas actividades humanas que muy seguramente no puedan ser desarrolladas nunca por la IA, porque son actividades consustanciadas al ingenio y creatividad humana y muy difícilmente puedan ser emuladas exitosamente por una máquina; no referimos a la poesía, la literatura o incluso la filosofía. Otras actividades geopolíticas, como la toma de decisiones estratégicas por parte de un Estado de usar o no un arma de destrucción masiva, para neutralizar o destruir las capacidades militares de un enemigo real o potencial en el marco de un conflicto bélico, no pueden dejarse a la consideración exclusiva de una entidad no humana que carece de sentimientos y empatía y, en definitiva, no tiene conciencia para ser y hacer, más allá de lo que establece el código o algoritmo que determina su programación.

More specifically, on a strictly legal level, there is already a set of laws that should be analyzed to have a more complete view of international trends in the field of AI regulation in the world. Below are some of the main laws and regulatory frameworks that currently regulate the use of AI:

In the European Union EU, the Artificial Intelligence Regulation (European Parliament, 2024) stands out, which seeks to ensure safety and respect for fundamental rights in the development and use of AI systems. This regulation also focuses on the classification of AI systems, according to their level of risk, and establishes specific requirements for each category, from high-risk systems to low-risk applications. According to the text of the regulation itself:

The objective of this Regulation is to improve the functioning of the internal market by establishing a uniform legal framework, in particular for the development, placing on the market, putting into service and use of artificial intelligence systems ("AI systems") in the Union, in accordance with the values of the Union, in order to promote the adoption of human-centred and trustworthy artificial intelligence (AI), while ensuring a high level of protection of health, safety and fundamental rights as enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.... (European Parliament, 2024)

Due to its significance, the proposal on the adaptation of tort liability rules to artificial intelligence (European Commission, 2022) also stands out in the EU. Broadly speaking, this proposal seeks to ensure that persons harmed by technology can obtain financial compensation. Negotiations on this directive are ongoing and are expected to resume in 2024. For

its part, in the USA the so-called white paper, entitled: Preparing for the Future of Artificial Intelligence (Executive Office of the President, 2016), lays the groundwork for allowing the development of AI technologies with few restrictions, focusing on the assessment of risks to public safety. However, there is no specific federal law regulating AI comprehensively, and regulation is addressed through various scattered agencies and sectoral frameworks.

In this context of international legislative production to regulate and control as much as possible the technological development of AI, various international bodies, such as the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the G20, have adopted principles and recommendations for the regulation of AI (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2024). The OECD adopted its Recommendations on AI in May 2019, and the G20 adopted AI Principles in June 2019. UNESCO has also worked on a global standard-setting instrument on AI ethics, adopted at its General Conference in November 2021 (UNESCO, 2024).

The regulation of artificial intelligence is a rapidly evolving field, with significant efforts in various regions of the world to ensure that the development and use of AI is safe, ethical, and transparent. The European Union and some Latin American countries have adopted risk-based approaches, while the United States and China are developing sectoral and specific regulatory frameworks for certain AI applications (UNESCO, 2024).

The global legal challenges posed by AI, as mentioned above, can be addressed by criteria for the construction of legislation that, on the one hand, manages to regulate privacy and civil rights, as a guarantee that AI systems do not violate civil privacy rights, such as the ability to make decisions without human influence. This includes regulation of the collection of personal data by AI systems. On the other, regulation of autonomy, to ensure that AI systems cannot make autonomous decisions that violate human rights. For example, an AI system could not decide to take the life of a human being under any circumstances. What to do with drones used in military conflicts?

In addition, and as already seen with UNESCO's contributions on the ethical use of AI, a well-structured ethical framework should be able to ensure that AI systems do not violate human ethics, and thus conform to the ethical and moral parameters of the society in which it operates as a technological entity with the capacity to modify the natural and cultural world. Undoubtedly, the greatest expression of global ethics is in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

Taken together, these ethical and legal regulations seek to ensure that AI systems do not violate human rights and cannot make decisions that violate other rights, without the consent of the human person. However, so far AI is far from surpassing human intellect in terms of ingenuity, autonomy, consciousness, and empathy, among other aspects that define the rational nature of a person in general, so that ontologically speaking AI is only an entity without nature, identified by its instrumental essence.

Economic challenges

The economic impact of AI on the global system is of transcendental importance. AI has the essential potential to transform the global economy, increasing GDP and improving efficiency in various sectors. However, it also presents challenges such as unemployment due to the replacement of traditional labor and the need to ensure that the wealth generated is distributed equitably to avoid widening technological and social gaps. In a context in which AI controls a good part of the services and productive processes, the need for public-private collaboration is crucial to respond to these challenges and maximize the benefits of AI, without overly harming the labor rights of ordinary people.

All the industrial revolutions experienced by humanity so far, from the Age of Enlightenment to the 21st century, have displaced a significant group of workers from their jobs, due to the modernization and technification of productive processes; however, these realities of change do not have to be definitely negative for ordinary workers and other vulnerable groups within a given society; in contrast, AI can create a consistent dynamic of sustainable development that, under certain conditions, can increase the gross domestic product of a country, region or continent with a direct impact on the per capita index. In this scenario, a set of redistributive social policies within the framework of the social state could guarantee a dignified life for the majority and reduce the strenuous working hours typical of global capitalism.

According to information provided by the International Monetary Fund IMF, in the coming years: "Artificial intelligence (AI) will affect nearly 40% of jobs worldwide, replacing some and complementing others. "To take advantage of this potential, economic policies driven by countries must strike a fine balance" (IMF, 2024, par., 02). However, the economic impact will not be equal in all countries and regions of the world, it will be greater in the societies of the so-called global north with high levels of technification of their economies:

> The findings are remarkable: almost 40% of global employment is exposed to AI. Historically, automation and information technology have tended to affect routine tasks, but one of the characteristics that sets AI apart is its incidence in high-skill jobs. Therefore, AI carries greater risks for advanced economies compared to emerging and developing markets, but also presents them with more opportunities to exploit the advantages (IMF, 2024, par., 04).

To alleviate the jobs lost by the emergence of AI to the economy some experts have proposed, as of now, a Universal Basic Income, given that:

> "Indisputably, many of the tasks that office workers do now will look very different in the next five to 10 years," Suleyman commented. "That needs material compensation." For the current founder of Inflection, the solution to the problem lies in the implementation of a basic income that covers the economic needs of citizens. And in his talk, he encouraged governments to study it urgently: "It's a political and economic measure that we need to start talking about seriously," he explained. (El Confidencial, 2023, par., 1)

Other business personalities such as the tycoon Elon Musk, says that human intelligence is doomed with the total hegemony of AI in all human activities, so that natural intelligence will have, in the near future, only a 1% pact in the economic one: about this situation the tycoon says: "The percentage of intelligence that is biological is decreasing with each passing month. In the end, the percentage of biological intelligence will be less than 1%", said Musk... 'Biological intelligence can serve as a backup, as a buffer for intelligence" (Duboust, 2024, pars., 1 and 3).

Indeed, the greatest economic, political and legal challenge generated by the emergence of AI in today's world has to do with the strategic capacity of human societies to implement this technology for the benefit of the development of human capabilities (Nussbaum, 2012), to be and to do freely and on the threshold of violence and poverty, which demands the design of a political architecture that creates, based on contextual needs, the necessary plans and projects to keep under control all AI experiences and at the same time reduce its problematic aspects, where they exist. Thus, soon, AI can be a crucial tool for driving sustainable development.

Conclusions and recommendations

In ontological terms, artificial intelligence is a powerful technology with the potential to transform multiple aspects of society. However, its development and application must be carefully managed to address the political, legal, and economic challenges posed by its general use in the 21st century, which requires a balanced and critical view of this phenomenon that can assess its contributions, benefits, opportunities, and latent threats on an equal footing.

In its differential essence, artificial intelligence represents one of the most significant technological innovations of the 21st century, with the capacity to transform multiple aspects of society. Its "nature" is based on the creation of systems capable of performing tasks that normally require human intelligence, such as learning, reasoning and decision making. At its core, AI is classified into two main types: weak AI, which focuses on specific tasks, and superior AI, which aims to match or surpass human intelligence in all areas. So far superior AI is only a theoretical possibility, nothing more.

In this context, ontology attempts to determine what are the ends of the entities and beings that present themselves to consciousness in the experiential structure of the sensible world. In this sense, the purposes of AI are diverse and range from automating processes and improving efficiency and productivity, to making informed decisions and creating fairer and more sustainable systems. In business, for example, AI enables employees to focus on more strategic and creative tasks, improving the customer experience and reducing human error. Furthermore, AI has the potential to drive global economic growth and contribute to the creation of more equitable systems, however, in an ontological analysis one must always differentiate between power and act, and this is no exception.

Overall, the development and application of AI presents significant political, legal and economic challenges. Politically, AI may reconfigure power relations and generate uncer-

tainty about the control and governance of these technologies. Legally, there is a need to develop regulatory frameworks that address accountability for the actions of intelligent machines and protect human rights. Economically, AI can increase efficiency and GDP, but it also poses risks such as unemployment and social inequality.

In short, artificial intelligence is, in essence and existence, an effective tool with the potential to transform society in a profound way, or even to transform human nature itself as assumed by proponents or detractors of transhumanism. Either way, to maximize its benefits and mitigate its risks, it is crucial to manage its development and application carefully and ethically, ensuring that the political, legal, and economic challenges posed by AI in a world dominated by the processes of digitization of social life and the symbolic extension of virtual universes are addressed.

Finally, the strong artificial intelligence hypothesis demonstrates that there are reasonable ontological concerns (the being and doing of AI) about the potential security risks and long-term existential risks associated with the development of increasingly advanced and autonomous AI systems. To address these challenges, regulatory agencies around the world must adopt interdisciplinary approaches that combine technical, legal, ethical, and public policy expertise. At the same time, they must foster collaboration between the public and private sectors, as well as the involvement of civil society, to ensure that regulations are effective, balanced, and responsive to the needs and concerns of all stakeholders.

References

Arbeláez-Campillo, D., Villasmil, J., & Rojas-Bahamón, M. (2021). Inteligencia artificial y condición humana: ¿Entidades contrapuestas o fuerzas complementarias? *Revista de Ciencias Sociales,* XXVII (02), 502-513. https://doi.org/10.31876/rcs.v27i2.35937.

Asimov, I. (2008). *El círculo vicioso (Runaround - 1942).* Barcelona: Inteligencia Educativa.

Colella, L. (2016). Un análisis ontológico de la educación a partir de los aportes de Badiou y Rancière. *Estudios de Filosofía*, (53), 165-182. https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=379846136008.

Comisión Europea. (2022). *Propuesta de Directiva del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo relativa a la adaptación de las normas de responsabilidad civil extracontractual a la inteligencia artificial.* Bruselas: (Directiva sobre responsabilidad en materia de IA).

Duboust, O. (14 de mayo de 2024). *Elon Musk predice que la IA superará a los humanos hasta el punto de que "la inteligencia biológica será del 1%"*. Obtenido de Euro News: https://es.euronews.com/next/2024/05/12/elon-musk-predice-que-la-ia-superara-a-los-humanos-hasta-el-punto-de-que-la-inteligencia-b#:~:text=De%20momento%2C%20la%20IA%20tiene,inteligencia%20será%20digital"%2C%20añadió.

El Confidencial. (15 de abril de 2023). *La posible solución al 80% de desempleo que traerá la inteligencia artificial*. Obtenido de Tecnología: https://www.elconfidencial.com/tecnologia/novaceno/2023-05-12/inteligencia-artificial-empleo-soluciones-politica_3627892/

Escenario Mundial. (20 de abril de 2024). *Estados Unidos exige a China y Rusia declarar que la inteligencia artificial no controlará armas nucleares*. Obtenido de https://www.escenario-mundial.com/2024/05/03/estados-unidos-exige-a-china-y-rusia-declarar-que-la-inteligencia-artificial-no-controlara-armas-nucleares/

Executive Office of the President. (2016). *Preparing for the future of artificial intelligence.* Washington D. C.: National Science and Technology Council.

Ferrater Mora, J. (2004). *Diccionario de Filosofía E-J.* Barcelona: Ariel Filosofía.

FMI. (16 de enero de 2024). *La economía mundial transformada por la inteligencia artificial ha de beneficiar a la humanidad*. Obtenido de Inteligencia artificial: https://www.imf.org/es/Blogs/Articles/2024/01/14/ai-will-transform-the-global-economy-lets-make-sure-it-benefits-humanity#:~:text=La%20inteligencia%20artificial%20(IA)%20afectará,deben%20encontrar%20un%20fino%20equilibrio.

Fukuyama, F. (2004). Transhumanism. *Foreign Policy*, (144), 42-43. https://philosophy.as.uky.edu/sites/default/files/Transhumanism%20-%20Francis%20Fukuyama.pdf.

Fundación CEDE. (2023). *Revolución digital Impacto de las nuevas tecnologías en el directivo.* Madrid: Fundación Cede.

Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and Method.* New York: Continuum.

Giraldi, E. (14 de octubre de 2019). *Digitalización, política e inteligencia artificial ¿Qué futuro podemos esperar?* Obtenido de Nueva sociedad: https://www.nuso.org/articulo/digitalizacion-politica-e-inteligencia-artificial/

González, R., & López, L. (2016). Pierre Hadot: el cuidado de sí y la mayéutica socrática como ejercicio espiritual. *Ciencia Ergo Sum*, 23 (01), 26-34. https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/104/10444319004.pdf.

Hoyos, E., & Pocovi, M. C. (2020). Análisis de la ontología de un concepto relativista: Inducción Electromagnética. *Revista electrónica de investigación en educación en ciencias*, 15 (02), 38-47. http://www.scielo.org.ar/pdf/reiec/v15n2/v15n2a04.pdf.

López de Mántaras, R. (2018). Hacia la inteligencia artificial Progresos, Retos y Riesgos. *Mètode Science Studies Journa*, (99), 45-51. DOI: 10.7203/metode.9.11145.

Marcos, A. (2010). *Filosofía de la naturaleza humana.* Paris: I Simposio del CFN École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (París).

Marín, R. (01 de mayo de 2024). *Un informe de seguridad reveló que la Inteligencia Artificial podría facilitar los ataques de destrucción masivos*. Obtenido de Infobae: https://www.in-

fobae.com/estados-unidos/2024/05/01/un-informe-de-seguridad-revelo-que-la-inteligencia-artificial-podria-facilitar-los-ataques-de-destruccion-masivos/

Martínez, M. (2009). *La nueva ciencia Su desafío, lógica y método.* México DF: Trillas.

Medina, P., & Quiroz, W. (2017). *Análisis ontológico en textos escolares de ciencias naturales y biología.* Sevilla. https://ddd.uab.cat/pub/edlc/edlc_a2017nEXTRA/67_-_Analisis_ontologico_en_Textos_escolares_de_Ciencias_Naturales_y_Biologia.pdf: X Congreso internacional sobre investigación en didáctica de las ciencias.

Nussbaum, M. (2012). *Crear capacidades Propuesta para el desarrollo humano.* Barcelona: Paidós.

Organización para la Cooperación y el Desarrollo Económico. (14 de marzo de 2024). *Mejores políticas para una vida mejor*. Obtenido de Cuarenta y dos países adoptan los Principios de la OCDE sobre Inteligencia Artificial: https://www.oecd.org/espanol/noticias/cuarentaydospaisesadoptanlosprincipiosdelaocdesobreinteligenciaartificial.htm

Parke, M. (14 de noviembre de 2023). *Prevenir el Armagedón nuclear de la IA*. Obtenido de El economista: https://www.eleconomista.com.mx/opinion/Prevenir-el-Armagedon-nuclear-de-la-IA-20231113-0127.html

Parlamento Europeo. (2024). *Reglamento de Inteligencia Artificial.* Bruselas: Textos Aprobados.

Parra, D., & Concha, R. (2021). Inteligencia artificial y derecho. Problemas, desafíos y oportunidades. *Vniversitas*, 20, 02-25. https://revistas.javeriana.edu.co/index.php/vnijuri/article/view/35364/26613.

UNESCO. (2024). *Foro Global sobre la Ética de la IA 2024.* Kranj: IA.

Vallès, J. M. (2000). *Ciencia Política Una introducción.* Barcelona: Ariel Ciencia Política.