Capítulo 8
The "AI Ethics" Fraud and the Threat
of Western Cultural Hegemony

Emmanuel R. Goffi

What if "AI Ethics" was just a catchphrase? What if the wording was even more of a Trojan horse, a strategy to lower consumers alertness and acculturate them to a narrative promoting the adoption of artificial intelligence (AI)?

The question is not neutral and is worth being asked. The overuse of the phrase "AI ethics" and its spread should incite us to question its significance, its relevance, and its potential implications.

Short of such a questioning, we accept the potentiality of being influenced in a way that might not be for our benefit. We even implicitly accept to be subject to potential manipulation. More than that we accept to be passively part of the enterprise. Interestingly, while the question of autonomy is widely debated in the field of AI and robotics, it is not when it comes to our autonomy of thought, and incidentally of decision.

Discourse is a great potentate, as Greek sophist Gorgias of Leontini already wrote it in his *Encomium of Helen* in the 5th century BCE. The weigh of discourse in the modelling of perceptions and consequently of behaviors, has never been negated. Quite the opposite! Marketing and communication experts have been using words to influence people and lead them to act in a certain way for decades. Philosophers, lawyers, and politicians have done the same for centuries.

Social constructivists have stressed the importance of language in the shaping of perceptions (Berger & Luckmann 1966). Philosophers, notably of language, have extensively studied its performative dimension (Austin 1962, Searle 1969, Parker & Sedgwick 1995) and others have even decried its use to control people's behaviors (Herman & Chomsky 2002, Foucault

2004, Stiegler 2018), and stressed its role in limiting our perspectives on the world we live in (Wittgenstein 1922).

Yet, the current narrative on AI ethics has been fully adopted, taken for granted in all its components without critical thinking regarding its origins, relevance, and concealed agenda. So far, and to put it bluntly, humanities have been unable to fully play their role in addressing so-called AI ethics, and in many instances, disturbingly unwilling to do so.

Reducing ethics applied to AI (EA2AI) to a handful of ill-defined words and phrases easy to catch, to remember and to digest, might be dangerous in the long run. It might have harmful consequences for humanity.

The discourse on "AI Ethics" needs more than ever to be questioned. It needs o be contextualized to understand what is concealed behind the reassuring wording on values and ethics. The wording itself must be examined to comprehend how it participates in the shaping of our perceptions and eventually to the control of our behaviors. Short of a critical approach of so-called "AI ethics", we might son fall in the trap of some cultural hegemony from the Western world (also called global North), and to increasing tensions between cultures that will add to existing ones.

The following lines are meant to offer some outside the box perspectives. They do not pretend to any kind of truth. If some debate could stem from them, it will be a huge success.

The Word is not Enough

As Austrian-British philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein wrote it:

> "[t]hat the world is my world, shows itself in the fact that the limits of the language (the language which only I understand) mean the limits of my world". (1922:5.62)

This inevitably results in a limited comprehension of the world one lives in. The range of vocabulary one can use and the meaning one attributes to words will define what one is able to interpret and to express. Poets, for instance, playing with words, can express a wide variety if ideas projecting in sentences their interpretation of the world in a way most people cannot. From those limits will stem perceptions regarding our

environment. One will then interpret the world and build their opinion through this narrow lens.

Knowing about this cognitive limitation, it is easy to use it to influence people and lead them to adopt specific perceptions that will turn into specific behaviors.

One may either use common words that are conveying general meanings to build a narrative that will sound familiar to others and make them adopt certain ideas

Words can be weapons. Put together in a narrative build around a pre-defined goal they can influence people without them even being aware of it.

Such a powerful tool is widely used to manufacture consent as Herman and Chomsky put it (2002). In 1922, Walter Lippman coined the phrase "manufacture of consent", asserting that:

> "[t]he creation of consent is not a new art. It is a very old one which was supposed to have died out with the appearance of democracy. But it has not died out. It has, in fact, improved enormously in technic, because it is now based on analysis rather than on rule of thumb." (1922:248)

According to French philosopher Barbara Stiegler, Lippmann's assertion has been made even more relevant with the advent of neoliberalism and behavioral sciences that consider human minds as ill-adapted to their henceforth globalized environment, and consequently as unable to make rational decisions. From there the idea that minds should be educated through experts' knowledge and artifices of law and supported by an "invasive return of State action within all spheres of social life" (2022:2). Eventually, following Lippmann and the neoliberals, an undertaking of "massive readaptation of the human species, led from above by the expertise of leaders, and removed in principle from citizen control" (*Id.* 23) has been initiated in the early 20th century.

What Stiegler clearly denounces, is a neoliberal hegemony grounded in social Darwinism promoted by Herbert Spencer (1864) and its famous "survival of the fittest", namely what Charles Darwin has called *Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* (1859). One might disagree with her point, but it does not make it less worth being explored.

The will to control individuals and/or groups of individuals, is nothing new and can be traced back to the very appearance of democracy, and certainly even before. Since then, elites' paternalism aiming at educating citizens to behave in appropriate way telling them what is best for them, has become a normal way to control populations. The new panopticon's walls are now made of words instead of bricks.

The phrase "discourse is a great potentate" has never been so true. Controlling populations' behaviors using narratives is now widely used and is part of the famous Foucauldian governmentality, namely the *"ensemble* formed by the *institutions, procedures, analyses, reflections, calculations and tactics* that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power, which has as its target population" (Foucault 2004). In the "era of 'biopower'", that is the technology of power used to managed groups of humans, discourse is a main component of biopolitics aiming at "achieving the subjugation of bodies and the control of populations" (Foucault 2003, 2008), submitting the population to rules set by governing bodies without using physical constraint, the final goal being to make the governed think they consent while they obey, that they decide where they conform.

These developments might sound excessive and frightening. Yet, their applications in our everyday lives are numerous. From political communication, to marketing, to war propaganda, words are used to influence, to shape perceptions, to make people (re)act in certain ways. Words participate to nudges, namely the "architecture that alters people's behavior in a predictable way without forbidding any options or significantly changing their economic incentives" (Thaler & Sunstein 2008).

They are used to build performative utterances, turning assertions into reality. Saying that AI must be trustworthy is one example among others. The statement is not grounded in solid demonstration but on a mere arbitrary assertion to be found in the *Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI* written in 2019 by a group of High-Level Experts in AI set by the European Commission. Yet, the idea that trustworthy AI is a desirable goal to achieve has turned into a reality on which is now constructed a whole normative apparatus. So is the notion of cognitive biases presented as something that must be mitigated or removed. This performative utterance has been repeated to the point where it has become an ideology (Stiegler 2022). Examples could be multiplied repeatedly. Even the very existence of so-

called artificial intelligence might be questioned from the speech act perspective (Austin 1962).

Eventually, put together all these narratives contribute to a metanarrative about technology seen as a tool for progress, a means to control our environment for the benefit of humanity, and as an instrument that needs to be controlled since it might threaten humanity.

These subjective and narrow-minded ideas are supported by norms entrepreneurs, public and private, that clearly see their interests in lowering consumers alertness through cosm-ethics, namely some kind of make-up making AI appealing through "the creation of a whole narrative using ethical concepts, notions and vocabulary, without doing ethics. (…) [A] mere narrative used for communication purposes, that conveys ideas and interests that are not related to the ethical – in the strictest sense of the word – appraisal of artificial intelligence" (Goffi 2021).

Cosm-ethics has taken over real ethics to become the ground for further normative undertaking asserting the essential nature of void principles such as transparency, human control, or trustworthiness to cite but a few. It conveys cultural perspectives regarding human rights and the universality of values coming from the Western world without consideration of cultural diversity and due respect for divergent perspectives. Cosm-ethics proclaims the reality of a constructed world, presented as acceptable nay desirable, through what Thomas Metzinger, Professor of Theoretical Philosophy and former member of the commission's expert group that worked on the European guidelines, labeled "ethics washing made in Europe" (2019).

Narratives about AI ethics have been thoroughly honed and used to manufacture consumers' consent to adopt AI systems. As Metzinger relevantly put it about trustworthy AI, the narrative "is, in reality, about developing future markets and using ethics debates as elegant public decorations for a large-scale investment strategy" (2019).

The possibility of these performative narrative on "AI ethics" lies on the arbitrary abolition of the difference between words and their meanings. The use of words such as trust or ethics without further solid definition, leads us to believe that their meaning is unequivocal while each word can indeed be subject to different interpretations. This shrinking of the gap between the word (symbol or signifier) and its meaning (mental concept

of signified) (Saussure 1995) is a way to instill common perceptions in the mind of the public and to deny them the right to think by themselves.

Eventually, the whole narrative on AI ethics, along with the metanarrative in which it is included, are adopted without any further discussion. Their content and the very existence of the ideas they carry are taken for granted, digested, repeated, and widely adopted. The narrative structure the debate. It encloses our reflections within pre-defined lexical boundaries, making the limits of our world still narrower.

Even in cultural settings that are different from the European's one, this narrative is spreading.

The case of the Smart Dubai[118]'s *AI Ethics Principles and Guidelines* is a case in point, illustrating the absence of culture-grounded reflections and the conformism at play in the field of EA2AI. According to Belouali et al., "[t]he document issued by Smart Dubai overlaps to a great extent" the one issued by the UNESCO. Neither is its content "fundamentally different" from other documents produced by the European Commission (2022:15).

Unexpectedly, despite the Arab-Berber-Muslim culture of the Emirates, the *AI Ethics Principles and Guidelines* do not mention "any specific reference to the culture or the values of the United Arab Emirates", demonstrating that it is nothing else than a "necessary standardisation (marketing) aiming at a strategic positioning in the filed of AI" (Belouali et al. 2022:14).

In the same vein, the recently released Brazilian AI Bill, is nothing but a superficial copy-paste of European principles, "lacking strong reflections grounded in Brazil's domestic context and needs, the document sounds like a patchwork of ideas mostly taken from European existing instruments" (Goffi 2022a:27).

The same demonstration could be done with other guidelines published by other-than-European countries. In other words, irrespective of any cultural considerations, "AI ethics" has spread as an inevitable element to which communities all around the world should adhere if they want to access the AI market and benefit from its godsends. It has eventually become a prerequisite ingeniously imposed through a perlocutionary act

---

118 Smart Dubai is the Digital Dubai online platform presenting digital services offered by the government.

by Western norms entrepreneurs that are nothing else than Herman and Chomsky's consent manufacturers (2002).

Moving forward in this direction might prove dangerous. Denying the importance of ethics, hiding it behind the veil of cosm-ethics, and manufacturing consent through performative narratives is a risky bet in terms of the potential harmful consequences it can have on humanity at large. Imposing culturally grounded values through the AI ethics narrative can be perceived as digital colonialism. The strategy is highly disputable from an ethical perspective. It can exacerbate existing tensions between stakeholders or even give birth to new ones. It could lead to some form of ethical tyranny that some actors will not agree and even fight against (Goffi & Momcilovic 2022).

The Slippery Slope Towards Ethical Tyranny...

If we are not careful, the "tyranny of words" (Goffi et al. 2021) can quickly turn into an ethical tyranny that could be a Trojan horse for cultural hegemony. Intriguingly, this potential harmful risk related to AI is barely considered.

Despite mainstream concerns regarding biases in AI, the Western bias, namely the tendency of Western stakeholders to impose their views considering them as legitimate and universal, has never been addressed. Yet, on many occasions the European Union (EU) has made clear that the regulation of AI must reflect European values and that those values should be protected. This protectionist stance, which is not problematic in itself, sounds at odds with the European will to promote its ethical principles throughout the world without consideration for other stakeholders' values.

This tendency to impose Western values to the rest of the world does not go without several concerns. First, it illustrates the ongoing belief that the Western world/global North holds some sort of ethical superiority over other axiological systems. Second, it carries the idea that Western values being superior to some extent, they are worth being spread, even by force when and where deemed necessary. The spread of democracy and its misguided ways are a case in point here. Third, it conveys the conviction that some values are universal and could be the bedrock of some kind of

"universal AI ethics", justifying ethical proselytism. Fourth, it arbitrarily marks the borders of the debate, denying any stance that does not align with Western core beliefs.

The metanarrative about universal values plays a strong role in the shaping of perceptions regarding the possibility of a universal code of ethics for AI. It is also widely used to promote the spread of Western and more specifically European values in other cultural settings, giving birth to a concerning moral crusade. Backed up by cosm-ethics, this moral crusade will inevitably slip towards some form of ethical absolutism that is no more desirable than ethical relativism (Goffi 2021; Goffi et al. 2021).

So far there has been no solid proof of the existence of even one universal value. Quite the opposite, even if some studies show that there exists a common structure of values in most human communities, it seems clear that values are highly contingent and contextual (Goffi et al. 2021). However, the universalist stance remains predominant and barely challenged. Stuck in the universal ethics aporia, the West does not see that EA2AI must be contextualized and keeps shaping a narrative advocating the spread of its supposedly universal values.

The power of words can hardly be disputed. Philosophers of language such as Eve Sedgwick, John R. Searle, or John L. Austin have clearly demonstrated the role of language in modifying peoples' ideal structures. According to Austin, utterances, even when presented as mere statement, are usually "not intended at all, or only intended in part, to record or impart straightforward information about the facts". As an illustration he stresses that "'ethical propositions' are perhaps intended, solely or partly, to evince emotion or to prescribe conduct or to influence it in special ways" (Austin 1962). In other words, statements are hardly ever the expression of facts. They are hardly ever neutral. Using the word universal in the AI ethics narrative is not neutral. It sends a specific message regarding the feasibility and desirability of the establishment of ethical principles that should be accepted and implemented by all stakeholders irrespective of specific and local axiological stances.

To reinforce this narrative and legitimate the Western bias, the recourse to securitization proves to be an efficient strategy. Introduced by Ole Wæver in 1989, securitization refers to « the intersubjective establishment of an existential threat with a saliency sufficient to have substantial

political effects" (Buzan et al. 1998). It allows, through the use of a specific speech underlying the emergency to fight an existential threat, the use of all necessary means may they derogate from the regular normative framework. As Wæver put it, "[b]y naming a certain development 'state' claims a special right" (1989:4). Here the word security becomes the bedrock on which illocutionary act are built around the idea of sovereignty and the importance of its defence against "existential threats". Presenting AI as a potential threat to a specific human community or even to humanity allows norms entrepreneurs to justify their strategy. These norms entrepreneurs, such as the EU, "have among their instruments the speech act 'security' which has the effect of raising a specific challenge to a principled level implying that all means will - if necessary- be used to block the development in case. No rules will bind the state in this case, since the threat is defined as existential. A challenge to sovereignty" (Waever 1989). The current struggle over the normative dimension of AI is a perfect demonstration of the role communication is playing in shaping insidiously perceptions and eventually behaviors.

Using words such as ethics, principles, trustworthiness, accountability, human rights along with many other, lowers consumers' vigilance. The mere evocation of these words articulated in a specific narrative, suffices to instill in consumers' minds the feeling that AI is under control and developed to their benefit. Ethics-washing reassure people while et the same time allowing stakeholders to escape from more constraining rules. According to Ben Wagner, "the rise of the ethical technology debate runs in parallel to the increasing resistance to any regulation at all" for "ethics are seen as an alternative to regulation" (2018).

Adding security as an incentive to support supposedly universal principles helps making the argument acceptable. It is obvious that in the current discourse about AI, security is a huge concern. In the Western world AI is predominantly presented as threatening sovereignty, human rights, autonomy, values, democracy, employment, human relations to cite but a few examples. This securitization process applied to AI allows some stakeholders to further their agenda without having to justify their actions further.

The narrative and its supporting wording are here key in making the discourse adopted, internalized enough to lead to the shaping of specific perceptions which in turn will turn into specific behaviors. As an illustra-

tion, the recourse to the "war" narrative, by French President Emmanuel Macron to qualify the pandemic, has instilled in the mind of the French the idea that the Covid-19 was an existential threat legitimating the use of legally and ethically disputable measures, such as tracking applications and deprivation of liberty. Even if people were reluctant at first, they slowly accepted to be confined and to adopt the tracking system as ways to fight against the disease and limit its spread.

Nowadays "many of the most popular narratives about intelligent machines in the Anglophone West are shaped by the moment when 'a people's own AI-enabled power is turned – or turns – on them'" and "[i]n the most extreme form of this uprising, the AI wilfully exterminates humanity, or attempts to do so" (Dihal 2020:189).

This perception, built by certain stakeholders, shapes the relation between Westerners and AI and comfort them in the idea that measures must be taken to avoid the worse. Not only do they feel that AI is threatening them in their specific cultural environment, but they also think that what seems true for them is certainly true for the rest of the world. From there stem the idea that if the whole humanity shares the same concerns regarding AI, then it might agree on the same solutions, mainly proposed by the West.

Put it simply, some Western stakeholders, public and private, fear that consumers would be concerned about the potential risks related to AI and then would not consume AI products. To reassure them they build a complete narrative based on cosm-ethics. Then to make their normative undertaking acceptable they reinforce the feeling of threat through securitization, offering supposedly universal solutions to very local problems they have created and artificially made global. At the end of the day, the most artificial thing in artificial intelligence is the narrative on which it is built.

The problem with such an undertaking is that it crosses borders to spread widely irrespectively of cultural diversity. The underlying ideology of the "Western cultural imaginary" regarding AI (Liveley & Thomas 2020:44), influences "the perceptions of policymakers, and by steering public concerns, narratives also affect the regulation of AI systems" (Cave et al. 2020:10).

… And A Western Cultural Hegemony

The risk here is to fall into the trap of cultural hegemony that might turn into tyranny. Short of paying due respect to cultural diversity, the West is slowly creating the condition for future tensions around what some might label as digital colonialism.

It is worth stressing that while around 77% of ethical guidelines are elaborated by the West, this part of the world represents barely 15% of humanity (Goffi et al. 2021). Much more than that, since all Westerners are not involved in the regulation of AI, it means that within the Western world only a small group of people is deciding what is deemed ethically acceptable and what is not when it comes to AI. Obviously, some actors from other-than-West parts of the world are involved in the process.

Put together, in the field of AI regulation, "a global ruling class", made of some 20% of the world population according to Noam Chomsky (Herman & Chomsky 2002), has emerged and "controls the levers of an emergent trans-national state apparatus and of global decision making" (Robinson & Harris 2000). This AI ethics ruling class is supported by ethics frauds that are flooding into the ethics market (Goffi 2022a). These self-proclaimed "AI ethicists" capitalize on the narratives set by public institutions. They usually repeat what they have learned without any critical approach of the subject. Like the sophists who styled themselves as philosophers, ethics frauds mimic the manner of ethicists using a clever language to offer silver bullet one-it-all misleading solutions to their clients. Such an enterprise is made easier since the whole narrative toolbox is provided by institutional stakeholders. Doing so leads to the total abolition of any critical thinking regarding EA2AI. More than that it allows the debate to turn into an ideological polarization between those who pretend they hold some universal truth, and those who are not aligned with their stance.

What about the 80% remaining non-ruling class? What about the 85% of other than Western world? What will happen when China, as it clearly announced, will be the leader in the field of AI? What about Africa or India? Will raising actors in these areas still accept the Western hegemony when they will have gained power?

This is the biggest risk we are currently facing. Denying the right to divergent perspectives to have their say in the debate over EA2AI, impos-

ing a restrictive vision coming from a limited part of the world, spreading subjective ideas that do not necessarily represent the complex reality of the world we live in, will inevitably lead to either the reinforcement of existing tensions, or to the emergence of new ones.

The normative hold up the West at large and the EU specifically are engaged in in the field of AI will shortly face strong oppositions.

The current path towards universal or global principles framing the design, development, use and marketing of AI-fitted systems, clearly denies the reality of the cultural roots of ethics. Concerningly, this idea has nonetheless blossomed among international organizations such as the (OECD) Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), the Council of Europe, or the EU.

Yet, the international community has clearly established that respecting cultural diversity is deeply linked to the upholding of international security (Goffi & Momcilovic 2022). The UNESCO itself, despite its involvement in the establishment of global guidelines, stated in 2001 in the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity that "[t]he defence of cultural diversity is an ethical imperative, inseparable from respect for human dignity", stressing that cultural rights are "part of human rights". Consequently, the defense of human rights promoted by the EU should encompass the respect of cultural rights, that is to say the right of human communities not to be purposedly influenced in their ethical stance regarding AI. Some may argue that the EU is not acting that way intentionally looking for influence. Such an argument is highly disputable, but much more than the relevance of the argument itself, the fact that the question is not addressed is concerning.

The link between respect for cultural diversity and human dignity is present on several other international normative instruments such as the United Nations Charter (art. 13.2), the 2000 Millennium Declaration adopted by the UN General Assembly or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (art. 22). Beyond, the relation between respect for cultural diversity and international security is clearly stated in the UN Charter as well as the 1994 UN Human Development Report.

It is then clear that respecting cultural diversity is considered "an ethical imperative". If, as Greene et al. (2019) assert it, "[t]he whole narrative about ethics applied to AI, misleadingly named AI ethics, has been de-

signed with the aim of 'constructing and imposing a shared ethical frame on a contentious conversation'", it seems legitimate to question the potential undesirable consequences of the Western ethical proselytism.

The current narratives about "AI ethics" must not be minimized. Neither should it be overestimated. It must be questioned. To paraphrase Juvenal, we need to make sure that self-proclaimed guardians will be themselves guarded. We need to control institutions that are shaping the narratives as well as the ruling group of people that is both contributing to and promoting it. Within this group a particular attention must be brought to self-proclaimed AI ethicists and their potential disastrous impact, not only at a local level when they advise companies, but on the long run, on larger communities, nay on humanity.

Short of both a critical assessment of the AI ethics narratives and a thorough control of their promoters, we might end in a situation of deregulation of AI and even of strong tensions around cultural questions (Goffi & Momcilovic 2022).

Some voices have already raised to question or even to condemn what is now called AI colonialism arguing "that the impact of AI is repeating the patterns of colonial history" (Hao 2022). As Abeba Birhane (2020) wrote it "[i]n the Global South, technology that is developed with Western perspectives, values, and interests is imported with little regulation or critical scrutiny". Others, concerned bout the fact that "Artificial Intelligence is structurally, systematically, and psychologically altering not only local and global society, but what it means to be human, or, to be counted as such", are even asking whether AI can be decolonized (Adams 2021). Shakir, Png, and Isaac, are even calling "to avert algorithmic coloniality" through a "decolonial field of artificial intelligence: creating a critical technical practice of AI, seeking reverse tutelage and reverse pedagogies, and the renewal of affective and political communities" (Shakir et al. 2020).

These reflections illustrate growing concerns raising among human communities that feel their voices are nor listened to. Much more than that it demonstrates that these communities are opposing the current Western hegemonical enterprise using AI as the vehicle to spread their values. "[W]hen human beings are being influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations", even if "nobody

is committing direct violence", there still is "structural or indirect" violence (Galtung 1969) of which cultural violence is part of (Galtung 1990).

On the long term, these oppositions will undoubtedly grow bigger along with the feeling of violence and turn to tensions. The regulation of AI cannot and should not be the prerogative of a handful of Western norms entrepreneurs and consent manufacturers.

Conclusion

In *The Stakes of Diplomacy* Walter Lippmann relevantly stated that "[w]here all think alike, no one thinks very much" (1915:51). If there is a risk that urgently needs to be addressed in the field of EA2AI, it is the one associated with the lack of critical thinking regarding the "AI ethics" narrative. Cosm-ethics must be deconstructed to give room to real ethics where relevant. Sensitive questions must be critically tackled such as the Western bias, the narrative on AI ethics, the real goals of norms entrepreneurs, the role of ethics frauds, the impact of AI used as a Western cultural Trojan horse and many more.

Critical thinking is a key element to honestly assess the ethical acceptability of AI-fitted objects. Even if full objectivity is utopian, we must make sure that we are as axiological neutral as possible when we think about EA2AI. Humanities are here to help.

Short of such a critical approach the Western world/global North will engage in a hegemonic endeavor, a cultural proselytism that will be suffered as indirect violence, but violence anyway, by many human communities around the world. This might lead to tensions, and, who knows, to conflicts.

We need a broader perspective on EA2AI (Goffi & Momcilovic 2022). We need to think beyond forced march syncretism legitimated by an arbitrary universalist perspective and that will, unavoidably, result in internal conflicts for ethical domination and the disappearance of traditional wisdoms.

Building a governance framework respectful of cultural diversity cannot be done through shared values and a global code of EA2AI. It can only be done through cooperation, through attentive mutual listening and due respect for differences. To that end, governing AI must go through the establishment of clusters of communities sharing values and interests

that will decide upon what is best for them when it comes to the design, development, use and marketing of AI. A neutral body should be established as a mediating third party to smooth collaboration between clusters with highly divergent perspectives and interests, to help them meet in the middle of the bridge when possible. In any cases we need to contextualize reflections about EA2AI.

Beyond that, we need to monitor self-proclaimed AI ethicists. We need real AI ethicists to make sure that all questions are addressed in an as much objective way as possible (Goffi 2022a).

Bibliography

ADAMS, R. (2021). Can artificial intelligence be decolonized?. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, 46*(1-2), 176-197.

AUSTIN, J. L. (1962). *How to Do things with Words. The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955.* Oxford University Press.

BELOUALI, S., DEMAZEAU, Y., BOUCHENTOUF, T., & BRAHMI, H. (2022). Interrogation de l'universalité d'une éthique pour l'usage de l'IA au travers d'une lecture du code publié par Dubaï. *Ethique et Numérique, 1*(1), 1-17.

BERGER, P. L., & LUCKMANN, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge.* Penguin Books.

BIRHANE, A. (2020). Algorithmic Colonization of Africa. *Scripted, 17*(2), 389-409.

BUZAN, B., WÆVER, O., & WILDE, J. (de) (1998). *Security: A New Framework for Analysis.* Lynne Rienner.

DARWIN, C. (1859). *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life.* John Murray.

DIHAL K. (2020). Enslaved Minds: Artificial Intelligence, Slavery, and Revolt. In CAVE, S., DIHAL, K., & DILLON, S. (Eds.). *AI narratives: A history of imaginative thinking about intelligent machines.* Oxford University Press.

Eve Sedgwick,

FOUCAULT, M. (2003). *Society Must Be Defended*. Picador.

FOUCAULT, M. (2004). « Leçon du 1er février 1978 ». In FOUCAULT, M.. *Sécurité, territoire et population. Cours au Collège de France, 1977-1978*. EHESS-Gallimard-Seuil, 91-118.

FOUCAULT, M. (2008). *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France, 1978-1979*. Palgrave Macmillan.

GALTUNG, J. (1969). Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3) 167-191.

GALTUNG, J. (1990). Cultural Violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 27(3) 291-305.

GOFFI E. R. & MOMCILOVIC, A. (2022). Respecting cultural diversity in ethics applied to AI: A new approach for a multicultural governance. *Procedia Computer Science*.

GOFFI E. R., COLIN, L., & BELOUALI, S. (2021). Ethical Assessment of AI Cannot Ignore Cultural Pluralism: A Call for Broader Perspective on AI Ethics. *Arribat - International Journal of Human Rights Published by CNDH Morocco*, 1(2), 151-175.

GOFFI, E. R. (2020). Geopolítica de las éticas de la inteligencia artificial. *Vanguardia dossier*, (77), 84-88.

GOFFI, E. R. (2021). Escaping the Western Cosm-Ethical Hegemony: The Importance of Cultural Diversity in the Ethical Assessment of Artificial Intelligence. *AI Ethics Journal*, 2(2)-1.

GOFFI, E. R. (2022a). Brazil's AI Bill: Good Intention, Bad Execution. In Avanci T. F. S. (ed.). *Artificial Intelligence Report and The Brazil's AI Bill*. Centro de Estudos Sociedade e Tecnologia da Escola Politécnica da Universidade de São Paulo with Global AI Ethics Institute, International Group of Artificial Intelligence, and ETHICAI, 16-32.

GOFFI, E. R. (2022b). L'institutionnalisation des normes éthiques dans le domaine de l'intelligence artificielle : construction sociale à dépasser. *Revue Ethique et Numérique, 1*(1), 18-35.

GOFFI, E. R. (2022c). Real AI Ethicists are urgently needed. *Bulletins*, Centro de Estudos Sociedade e Tecnologia – Universidade de São Paulo.

GREENE, D., HOFFMANN, A. L., & STARK, L. (2019). Better, Nicer, Clearer, Fairer: A Critical Assessment of the Movement for Ethical Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning. *Proceedings of the 52nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences.*

HAO, K. (2022). Artificial intelligence is creating a new colonial world order. *MIT Technology Review.*

HERMAN, E. S., & CHOMSKY, N. (2002). *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media (1988).* Pantheon Books.

LIPPMANN, W. (1915). *The Stakes of Diplomacy.* Heny Holt and Company.

LIVELEY, G., & THOMAS S. (2020). Homer's Intelligent Machines: AI in Antiquity. In CAVE, S., DIHAL, K., & DILLON, S. (Eds.). *AI narratives: A history of imaginative thinking about intelligent machines.* Oxford University Press.

METZINGER, T. (2019). EU Guidelines: Ethics washing made in Europe. *Der Tagsspiegel.*

MOHAMED, S., PNG, M. T., & ISAAC, W. (2020). Decolonial AI: Decolonial theory as sociotechnical foresight in artificial intelligence. *Philosophy & Technology, 33*(4), 659-684.

MOHAMED, S., PNG, M. T., & ISAAC, W. (2020). Decolonial AI: Decolonial theory as sociotechnical foresight in artificial intelligence. *Philosophy & Technology, 33*(4), 659-684.

PARKER, A., & SEDGWICK, E. (1995). *Performativity and Performance.* Routledge.

ROBINSON, W.I., & HARRIS, J. (2000). Towards a global ruling class? globalization and the transnational capitalist class. *Science & Society, 64*, 11-54.

SAUSSURE, F. (de) (1995). *Cours de linguistique générale.* Grande Bibliothèque Payot, [1959].

SEARLE, J. (1969). *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language.* Cambridge University Press.

SPENCER, H. (1864). *The Principles of Biology.* Williams and Norgate.

STIEGLER, B. (2022). *Adapt !: On a New Political Imperative.* Translated from French by A. Hocker. Fordham University Press.

THALER, R. H., & SUNSTEIN, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth and Happiness.* Yale University Press.

WÆVER, O. (1989). Security, the Speech Act: Analyzing the Politics of the Word. *Centre for Peace and Conflict Research*, Working Paper 19.

WAGNER, B. (2018). Ethics as an Escape from Regulation: From "ethics-washing" to ethics-shopping?. In BAYAMILOGLU, E., BARALIUC, I., JANSSENS, L. and HILDEBRANT, M. (Eds). *Being Profiled: Cogitas ergo sum.* Amsterdam University Press, 84-88.

WITTGENSTEIN, L. (1922). *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus.* Trubner & Co.