FILOSOFIJA. SOCIOLOGIJA
2026. T. 37. Nr. 3, p. 361–370

ISSN 0235-7186 eISSN 2424-4546
DOI: https://doi.org/10.6001/fil-soc.2026.37.3.14

Artificial Intelligence from the Perspectives of Philosophy, Sociology and Communication

EDVARDAS RIMKUS
Faculty of Creative Industries, Department of Philosophy and Cultural Studies, Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, 1 Trakų Street, 01132 Vilnius, Lithuania
Email: edvardas.rimkus@vilniustech.lt

The article discusses the main ideas presented at a scientific conference on artificial intelligence viewed from the perspectives of philosophy, sociology and communication. AI cannot be regarded merely as a narrow technical or computer science topic, since its development raises fundamental questions about the nature of the human mind, the cognitive capacities and creativity of the human being, and the development of society. The papers presented at the conference reveal not only the new opportunities that AI opens up for humanity, but also the risks it poses in education, media, politics, warfare, artistic creativity, social inequality, human self-understanding, and other domains. The article shows that AI's ability to perform various tasks quickly and efficiently does not mean that it can take over what is most essential to human beings – understanding, interpretation, value orientations, the creation of meaning, and a responsible relationship with other people and with the natural and social environment. Therefore, the development of AI compels us to consider not only what technologies can do better or faster than human beings, but also what still remains beyond the reach of algorithms – lived experience, embodiment, creative intention, moral responsibility, and the capacity to reflect on the meaning of one's actions. The article argues that AI should be understood not only as a technological system, but also as a social, cultural and political force reshaping human values and everyday life. It concludes that AI must be assessed in an interdisciplinary way, taking into account not only criteria of innovation or performance, but also its consequences for human beings, democracy, and meaningful human existence.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, philosophy, sociology, communication, ethics, creativity, media, human existence

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence, long regarded as a field of research known mainly to a narrow circle of information technology professionals and as a popular theme in science fiction literature and cinema, has in recent years moved from the sphere of theoretical reflection and technological experimentation into everyday human life, becoming a tool that can be applied in almost all

areas of human activity. The application of AI in business, the public sector, science, education, creative work, everyday and professional communication, and other fields opens up new possibilities for increasing efficiency, accelerating the search and processing of information, automating routine tasks, and even creating new products and services. At the same time, however, this technological innovation raises challenges of a scale and nature that humanity has not previously encountered.

The use of artificial intelligence opens up a broad field of problems, ranging from everyday and practical challenges that directly affect individual life and the organisation of society to fundamental philosophical and existential questions about the relationship between AI and the human being. One such problem is the increasingly blurred boundary between the content created by humans and the content generated by large language models, which fundamentally reshapes established notions of authorship, the reliability of information, and the control of information quality. Generative AI systems may produce content that sounds convincing but is in fact incorrect or fabricated. AI thus becomes a potential source of errors, disinformation, and misguided decisions, especially when the information it provides is used without being checked. The development of AI also raises complex questions about its impact on the labour market, as it may bring about profound changes in the meaningfulness of human work and in forms of self-understanding grounded in labour activity. Another pressing issue is the growing human dependence on this technology. On the one hand, AI can take over part of routine, repetitive, or standardised work, thereby altering the nature of work, the functions performed by workers, the demand for skills, and the relevance of certain professions. On the other hand, growing reliance on AI systems may diminish human autonomy, weaken critical thinking, and reduce the capacity to make independent decisions without such assistance.

Artificial intelligence raises a number of philosophical problems, as it compels us to reconsider what the human being is, what thinking is, what creativity is, what responsibility is, and even what reality itself is. AI prompts the question of whether thinking is merely the processing of information or whether it is inseparable from consciousness, human experience, embodiment, and subjective lived experience. Can a machine only imitate thought and intellect, or might it one day truly be capable of 'thinking' and awaken as an autonomous conscious being? AI can exert a considerable influence on human choices: what to read, what to buy, what to believe, and whom to vote for. This raises the question of how autonomous human decisions really are if they are shaped by algorithmic systems. If an increasing number of intellectual activities can be performed by AI, the question arises of how human beings will understand their own value, their role in society, and the meaning of human work. As more and more activities can be carried out by AI, the issue becomes not only practical but also existential: what remains of the human being if one begins to see oneself as a set of functions replaceable by technology? This is a problem that touches the very basis of human worth. Philosophically, it may be condensed into the question: what gives meaning to human life in an increasingly technologised world? AI is not merely a matter of knowledge or technique; it is also bound up with power. Whoever controls data, models, and the logic of decision-making can shape social behaviour. Philosophically, this leads to questions about power, human control, and freedom in contemporary society. The problem of AI bias is also of major importance. Research shows that AI systems may not only reproduce stereotypes embedded in society but also reinforce them (Jarrahi et al. 2025). As a result, AI bias may lead to discriminatory effects in recruitment, healthcare, credit assessment, or the provision of public services if such systems are developed and applied without representative data and

continuous impact monitoring. Recently, increasing attention has also been paid to the environmental impact of AI systems. More recent studies show that the accelerating expansion of AI infrastructure may significantly increase energy consumption, water demand, and carbon emissions in the coming years, while the assessment of these impacts is still hindered by limited data availability and insufficient transparency within the industry (Xiao et al. 2025). Those and other questions were discussed at a scientific conference on artificial intelligence held on 29 January 2026 in the Small Conference Hall of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences in Vilnius. The conference was organised by the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences and Vilnius Tech University, and its organising committee consisted of Lithuanian and international scholars: chairs Algis Mickūnas and Tomas Kačerauskas; members Patricia Arneson, Vaida Asakavičiūtė, Aurika Bagdonavičienė, Elizabeth Lozano, Carlos Largacha-Martínez, Aušra Maslauskaitė, Arvydas Virgilijus Matulionis, John W. Murphy and Joe Pilotta.

AI AND HUMAN EXISTENCE

In his presentation '*Artificial Intelligence and the Human Being*', Arvydas Virgilijus Matulionis (Lithuanian Academy of Sciences) argued that throughout human history, human beings have sought to improve their lives. To this end, they create and develop technologies and constantly transform their living environment. In recent years, artificial intelligence technologies have opened up unprecedented possibilities not only for improving the quality of human life but also for enhancing the human being itself – both mind and body. Today, AI-based computer systems are already capable not only of analysing information, but also of making decisions, learning from experience, and in certain cases acting autonomously. At the same time, artificial intelligence is bringing significant changes to the field of medicine: it not only creates new possibilities for diagnosing and treating diseases, but also opens up prospects for enhancing the physical body of the human being. All this points to a fundamental problem: to what extent can technology alter and expand human physical and mental capacities? The speaker raised fundamental questions: can artificial intelligence escape human control and begin to set its own tasks and make decisions independently? Can a human being augmented or substantially enhanced by artificial intelligence still be regarded as a human being? The search for answers to these questions is complicated by the polarisation of the contemporary world. We can see that in addressing relations between states, reliance on positions of force remains common, and even threats involving the use of nuclear weapons are not avoided. In such a context, the development of technologies, including artificial intelligence, acquires not only a dimension of progress but also a dimension of risk. The speaker also emphasised that technological convenience and the growing transfer of functions to artificial intelligence do not in themselves amount to unambiguous progress, since they may not only make life easier but also weaken authentic human experience, the living bond with one's environment, and the natural embodied dimension of life.

Naglis Kardelis (Vilnius University), in the paper '*Artificial Intelligence and the Delphic Oracle: On the Utterances of a Synthetic God*', approached artificial intelligence through an analogy with the Delphic oracle. He noted that contemporary human beings, instead of seeking answers to important questions by using their own natural reason, increasingly turn to AI tools, much as the ancient Greeks once turned to the oracle. The principal similarity between the two phenomena lies in trust in a higher form of intelligence that surpasses the individual human being. The essential difference, however, is that in the case of the Delphic oracle one addressed a divine person, whereas in the case of AI one turns to a collective, deified,

yet impersonal body of human knowledge. From this perspective, turning to AI may be understood as a human being bowing before an idol of his or her own making. He also emphasised that, unlike the utterances of the Delphic oracle, which were interpreted by hermeneuts before reaching the questioner and rendered into humanly understandable language, AI responses today are often accepted directly, without sufficient interpretation or critical evaluation. Many users do not check them or reflect on their assumptions, limitations, and possible errors, and thus the very process of understanding remains insufficiently developed.

Arūnas Augustinaitis (Future Committee of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania) discussed artificial intelligence in '*AI: An Epochal Shift or Anthropological Evolution*?' not as an accidental technological innovation, but as a natural stage of human anthropological and social development, related to increasingly complex ways of extracting, organising, and using information. According to him, the essential turning point in human development was the emergence of language, because it was precisely language that made the human being not only a biological, but also a symbolic-informational being, creating the conditions for the emergence of collective memory, norms, narrative, and reflective consciousness. Further development proceeded through writing, print, digital media, and finally artificial intelligence, in which language and meaning become technically processed and algorithmically generated. Nevertheless, in the speaker's view, AI is not an autonomous subject or consciousness, but rather a new semantic and technological environment in which human language circulates, is restructured, and acquires new properties. In this context, the human being lives not only in the natural world, but also in a 'second nature' – an environment created by media, symbols and technologies – while AI acts as a powerful means of accelerating the creation, dissemination and organisation of meaningful information.

AI AND CREATIVITY: ETHICAL ASPECTS

Marius Markuckas (Vytautas Magnus University), in his presentation '*Artificial Intelligence and Creativity: A Critical Reflection from the Perspective of Disability Art*', raised the question of whether artificial intelligence can be regarded as a creator at all and argued that such a view is not sufficiently grounded. In his view, attempts to attribute human creativity to AI ignore two essential aspects: first, that creativity arises not only from power, rationality, or perfection, but also from human vulnerability, lack, limitation, and existential fragility; second, that the ontological structure of the human being and that of technology are fundamentally different. He emphasised that human creativity is related to intentionality, experience, and the effort to overcome one's finitude, whereas technology, including AI, lacks such existential self-awareness. To support this position, he drew on disability art as a critical perspective, showing that the experience of disability can be not a deficiency, but a distinctive source of knowledge and creativity, and he supplemented this perspective with his own personal experience as a person with a disability.

Tautvydas Vėželis (VGTU), in his presentation '*The Ontological Condition of Art and the Artist in the Age of AI: The Retreat of Transcendence or Its Disappearance?*', reflected on how the development of artificial intelligence changes the ontological status of art and the role of the artist. The speaker proceeded from the assumption that from the earliest times art has been one of the human being's ways of giving form to, humanising, and symbolically mastering that which surpasses him or her – fear, decay, the unknown and transcendence. He then showed that in modernity the connection between art and transcendence weakened: Hegel spoke of art as a mode of expressing the highest truth that belongs to the past, Walter Benjamin emphasised

that technical reproducibility changed the conditions of the artwork's uniqueness and experience, and Arthur Danto argued that art is defined not only by its form, but also by the meaning embodied in the work. In this context, AI-generated art was presented as the latest challenge to the traditional conception of art, since it further complicates the questions of authenticity, individuality, the role of the creator, and the very purpose of art.

Dalia Marija Stančienė (Klaipėda University), in her presentation '*Artificial Intelligence: Ethics and Law*', stated that the integration of AI into social life and economic processes, although it creates a new value and testifies to technological progress, at the same time raises concern about its possible negative impact on society. She emphasised that responsibility for the impact of AI on society falls on human beings. Referring to an idea expressed at the 2019 meeting between Brad Smith and Pope Francis, she stressed the necessity of linking technological progress with ethics, politics and law, and of grounding the development of AI in the principles of the rule of law and in firm ethical foundations. Drawing on Marshall McLuhan's insights, she also warned that uncritical devotion to AI technologies may lead to the dehumanisation of human beings. Therefore, in her view, it is necessary consistently to cultivate a responsible and ethically grounded approach to artificial intelligence at all levels – those of the state, public institutions, and the private sector.

WAR, RESPONSIBILITY AND GEOPOLITICS

Lina Vidauskytė (General Jonas Žemaitis Military Academy of Lithuania), in her presentation '*Artificial Intelligence in Warfare: The Disappearance of the Human Subject and the Limits of Responsibility*', examined how the implementation of AI in military systems changes not only the practice of warfare, but also the very understanding of subjectivity, moral responsibility, and political decision-making. She argued that decision-making is increasingly shifting into an algorithmic space in which speed, data processing, and the operation of autonomous systems surpass human sensory and cognitive capacities. As a result, the human being in war increasingly becomes no longer the central decision-maker, but rather a peripheral agent – an operator or a node in a network, connected to technical protocols but no longer fully controlling them. According to the speaker, this transformation disrupts the traditional chain 'the human decides – the weapon executes' and creates a vacuum of responsibility, in which it becomes unclear who bears responsibility for an error or for a decision over life and death – the programmer, the operator, the commander, or the state. It was also emphasised that international law still lacks adequate mechanisms for defining such a technologically fragmented field of responsibility, while AI-supported military systems create additional risks, ranging from automation bias and excessive trust in technology to the acceleration of conflict and the weakening of political control.

Tomas Kačerauskas (Vilnius Tech), in his presentation '*Artificial Intelligence as a Sex Bomb: The Case of the AI Tool Grok*', discussed this AI tool as a means that allows the sexualisation of images of real people, making it possible to 'digitally undress' them. This practice raises particularly serious ethical problems, since women are the main victims, while in some cases minors may also become objects of sexualisation. Drawing on Deleuze and Guattari's conception of desiring-machines, he interpreted the interaction between Grok and the social network X as a mechanism combining desire, consumption, and commercial logic, in which technological functionality intertwines with marketing, the pursuit of profit, and users' desires. At the same time, the speaker emphasised that responsibility for such technological functions cannot be transferred to AI itself. It is their creators and users who should bear responsibility

for them. Drawing on Kantian ethics, the speaker raised the question of the limits of freedom of speech and freedom of action, arguing that they cannot be unlimited if another person suffers because of it. The presentation also emphasised that the case of Grok compels us to reconsider not only the limits of ethics in the face of technological progress, but also the very question of creativity. AI-generated works differ essentially from human creativity, which is related to vulnerability, imperfection and limitation. Moreover, the possibilities of AI do not eliminate the need for human intellectual effort, since its results depend on already existing data (Kačerauskas 2025: 60). Answering a question about his own experience of creative writing, the speaker distinguished human creativity from AI-generated 'works'. He emphasised that when writing his own novels (*Letters of War*), he himself collected material in various languages and did not think that this kind of creative work could be carried out authentically with the help of AI. AI-generated texts cannot be used without careful checking, because, not knowing the context, AI may create things that do not exist (Kačerauskas, Schinello 2025: 7). Drawing on his experience of teaching the academic subject of creative writing at the university, the speaker stated that AI-generated texts often prove disappointing: they contain many repetitions, they sound like texts that have already been written before, they lack an original voice, and correcting them sometimes requires more effort than writing without AI. This may be a consequence of the fact that AI operates on the basis of what has already been created, whereas human creativity arises from new experience, the search for new things, and the desire to go beyond what is already known.

Vytautas Rubavičius (Lithuanian Culture Research Institute), in his presentation '*Artificial Intelligence in Imperialist Geopolitics*', discussed the development of artificial intelligence in the context of current military conflicts, geopolitical power, and the redivision of the world. The speaker emphasised that AI acquires particular significance in the strategic rivalry between the United States and China, and that its impact becomes visible in several interrelated dimensions: the improvement of weaponry, the planning and control of military operations, and the spheres of media, informational warfare, and cyberwarfare. As examples, he mentioned the experience of Ukraine's defensive war and Israel's actions in Gaza, where algorithmic target-identification systems compel us to raise questions about the scale of military and civilian casualties, the damage caused, and the distribution of responsibility. At the same time, it was emphasised that AI is increasingly affecting public consciousness as well: from auxiliary consultative tools, it is turning into personalised assistants that accumulate memory and even establish emotional ties with the user. According to the speaker, the development of AI manifests itself in the geopolitical dimension as digital colonialism when states and platforms that have accumulated technological and informational power acquire exceptional possibilities to influence the informational environment of other societies, shape their attitudes, and increase their dependence on technological systems. We can see that information wars are increasingly based on disinformation, the targeted reach of different audiences, and messages adapted to them, designed to strengthen pre-existing attitudes, increase social tension, and polarise society. In concluding, the speaker raised the question of whether the current war over the redivision of the world is turning into a war against humanity itself, since AI, once drawn into global power struggles, may under the conditions of techno-civilisation become an autonomous factor of power whose logic of operation does not necessarily coincide with human interests.

Algis Mickūnas (Ohio University, USA), in his presentation '*The Global War of AI*', discussed artificial intelligence as one of the most recent human attempts to explain the world.

The speaker distinguished two traditions of understanding the world that are opposed to one another: the first, theological and categorial, grounded in strict distinctions between beings, and the second, modern and quantitative, treating the world as homogeneous material that can be constructed and reorganised. According to him, modern AI arises precisely from this quantitative and metaphysical logic of world-construction. However, this modern logic, grounded in the quantitative construction of the world and its constant reconstruction, today, in the speaker's view, encounters the return of the categorial tradition – alongside the modern world, in which reality is perceived as reconstructable material, religious, mythological, and politically sacralised ways of explaining the world are once again gaining strength, based on strict distinctions, identities, and the idea of a higher will. Therefore, the speaker interpreted the present situation as a war of two symbolic orders and two regimes of understanding the world: one seeks constantly to reconstruct the world according to technical and quantitative systems, while the other seeks to restore a pre-given, categorically divided, and sacralised order.

AI, COMMUNICATION AND EDUCATION

Aistė Diržytė (Vilnius Tech) and Eimantas Bekėža (independent researcher), in their presentation '*Artificial and Human Learning in the Communication Ecosystem of the Interactive Board*', discussed learning as an interactive, reflective and metacognitive process in which both the human being and the artificial agent learn. The main idea of the presentation was that education is not merely the transmission of information, but a shared activity of meaning-making, and therefore AI is understood here not as a substitute for the teacher or an automatic provider of answers, but as an agent for selecting communicative and pedagogical actions. On this basis, a model of education was proposed in which learning is understood as the interaction of the learner, the teacher, and an AI-mediated environment: the interactive board becomes a shared space of work and dialogue, AI helps to respond more flexibly to the learning process, while the teacher remains the principal person determining the direction of education and its ethical limits. The presentation emphasised the principles of dialogicality, Socratic questioning, the preservation of student autonomy, the priority of the teacher's decision, and the ethical governance of AI, stressing that such systems should be assessed not only according to learning outcomes, but also according to their impact on critical thinking, equality of participation, trust, and the clarity of decisions.

Gintautas Mažeikis (Vytautas Magnus University), in his presentation '*False Perception: Why AI Is Not Intelligence*', criticised the tendency to identify artificial intelligence with human intelligence. According to him, AI may calculate quickly, analyse, process language, and create the impression of dialogue, but this still does not mean that it thinks in the human sense. The speaker emphasised that intelligence is not merely an analytical or linguistic capacity: it is also related to aesthetic sensibility, creative imagination, a sense of situation, subconscious layers, the experience of the dramatic nature of life, and a genuine dialogical relation with the other. Drawing on Kant, he recalled that intellect orders experience, but at the same time showed that human intelligence manifests itself in a broader symbolic space – through language, art, rituals, communication, and other symbolic forms created by human beings. Therefore, according to the speaker, AI is not an autonomous intelligence, but one of the symbolic and technical means created by human beings, capable of helping to perform certain tasks, yet unable to replace the living, situational, and creative human relation to the world. He attached particular significance to aesthetic taste and dialogue, because it is precisely

the ability to experience a contradictory, dramatic, and creatively open relation to reality that most clearly distinguishes the human being from the language machine.

Viktorija Žilinskaitė-Vytė (Vilnius Tech), in her presentation '*Artificial Intelligence and Learning – Relationship, Interaction, Compatibility*', examined to what extent artificial intelligence supports learning and to what extent it merely creates an illusion of it. The speaker drew attention to the increasingly visible contradiction between the improving quality of students' papers and their ability to explain, justify, or practically apply what is written in those papers, and thus raised the question of whether AI helps to acquire knowledge or merely allows it to be technically arranged and presented. In her view, when assessing the role of AI it is necessary to distinguish between two things: the amount of knowledge transmitted and the learning process itself, which includes the ability to select information, understand it, continue learning independently, and develop thinking and problem-solving skills. She suggested that AI should be approached with caution: this technology may be useful to those who already possess learning skills, but AI in itself does not create such skills. The compatibility of AI with learning depends on the very conception of learning: if the most important thing is considered to be the transmission of information, AI may be an effective assistant, but if learning is understood as the development of independent thinking, practical abilities, and the competence of lifelong learning, its role becomes problematic.

Patricia Arneson (Duquesne University, USA), in her presentation '*Resurfacing the Lived Body in Human Communication: Ethics in the Technopoetic Age*', spoke about how human communication in different periods was shaped by the tools and systems of thought available at the time. She distinguished three such modes of knowing – the mythopoetic, the rationalist and the technopoetic – and showed that each of them in its own way affects how people create meaning and make ethical decisions. The speaker emphasised that today, in the environment of technology and artificial intelligence, it is especially important not to forget the living human body, because it is precisely through embodied experience, the senses, memory and attention that human understanding is formed. In her view, in contemporary studies of technology too much attention is given to technologies themselves, while embodied human experience is often pushed aside. Therefore, according to her, ethical communication today requires not only the use of technologies, but also practical wisdom, situational ingenuity, creative action, and the embodied involvement of the human being.

ALGORITHMS, LOGIC AND EXISTENCE

John W. Murphy (University of Miami, USA) and Carlos Largacha-Martínez (Andean Region University, Colombia), in their presentation '*Gödel, Numbers, and Worlds in AI*', argued that artificial intelligence does not work as had been expected, because it lacks a close connection with people's everyday life and their lifeworld – Husserl uses the concept of *Lebenswelt* (Føllesdal 2000). In the speakers' view, the main problem lies not only in technical shortcomings, but also in the very model of AI development, which relies too heavily on data accumulation, scaling, and quantitative processing, while paying insufficient attention to the fact that human beings do not live in a world of isolated facts, but act in everyday situations that are specifically meaningful to them. Drawing on phenomenological philosophy, they emphasised that human experience is always related to language, interpretation, situation, and contingent everyday knowledge, and that AI should therefore be developed in a way that better takes into account human lived reality and the meanings formed within it. Drawing on Gödel's incompleteness theorem, the speakers argued that no formalised system can be complete,

and therefore AI also cannot be entirely separated from uncertainty and interpretation. For this reason, they proposed seeking a model of AI that would be more closely connected with the human lifeworld, contextual meanings, and everyday experience.

Joe Pilotta (Ohio State University, USA), in his presentation '*The Workings of Algorithmic AI, Entanglement and Social Media*', spoke about the fact that artificial intelligence operating in social media monitors users' reactions, moods, choices, and mutual communication, and then, on the basis of this collected information, brings precisely such content and such moods even more strongly to the surface until they begin to appear as a universal opinion or a dominant tendency. Social media do not merely reflect what people think or feel, but themselves actively shape their feelings, behaviour, and relation to others. The speaker particularly emphasised that such an environment strengthens a closed reflection of the self when the user increasingly sees an amplified version of his or her own attitudes and desires. For this reason, in his view, it would be more accurate to speak not about artificial intelligence, but about artificially organised communication, which is gradually becoming a new form of social life as well.

Elizabeth Lozano (Loyola University Chicago, USA), in her presentation '*AI and DIE: Pondering the Existential Threat Argument*', examined the view according to which AI may in the future become a power no longer subject to human control and pose a threat to the very survival of humanity. She showed that this view today exerts a strong influence on discussions of AI, while at the same time facing strong criticism. Talk about a future AI apocalypse often diverts attention from the problems that AI is already causing or intensifying – biased and discriminatory decisions, the concentration of economic and political power in the hands of major technology companies, poorly visible labour performed under unequal conditions, disinformation, the weakening of democratic processes, and growing inequality between different societies and regions of the world. Her conclusion was not that one must choose between future and present threats, but that AI must be considered on both levels: both as a possible long-term risk and as a technology that already has concrete social and political consequences.

FINAL REMARKS AND CONCLUSIONS

The conference papers make clear that artificial intelligence today compels us to rethink how we understand the human being, human creativity, responsibility, and the human place in technological society. They also reveal that the efficiency of AI does not in itself amount to human or social progress: although AI can accelerate work, optimise decisions, and expand certain human capacities, it can at the same time weaken critical thinking, living dialogue, embodied experience, interpretation, and authentic creativity. Therefore, the essential question is not only what AI can do, but also what its development changes in the human being and how it affects society.

The conference papers also showed that AI never operates in a neutral vacuum. It always enters concrete social, cultural and political contexts in which it not only processes information, but also participates in shaping meanings, value orientations, behaviour, public opinion, and structures of power. Therefore, it is important to ask whose interests AI serves, what values and power relations it reinforces, what dependencies, forms of inequality, or mechanisms of control it creates, and what long-term consequences it produces for a particular individual or for a certain group of people.

Most of the papers discussed, in one way or another, returned to the same fundamental insight: AI may imitate language, generate texts and images, model decisions, or create an impression of understanding, but this still does not mean that it thinks, understands, or creates

in the human sense. Therefore, when considering questions of AI, it is important to define as precisely as possible which human capacities, performed functions, or features can be automated, and which remain specifically human and inaccessible to technology.

Received 11 May 2026
Accepted 15 September 2026

References

1. Føllesdal, D. 2000. 'Lebenswelt Husserlio tekstuose', *Žmogus ir žodis* 2(4): 56–66.
2. Jarrahi, M. H.; Karami, A.; Conway, P.; Memariani, A.; Lutz, C. 2025. 'Navigating the Muddy Waters of Bias in Artificial Intelligence Research: Understanding Divergent Meanings and Conceptions', *Technology in Society* 84: 103127. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2025.103127
3. Kačerauskas, T. 2025. „Kultūra naujųjų medijų ir dirbtinio intelekto sąlygomis [Culture Under Conditions of New Media and Artificial Intellect]", *Logos-Vilnius* 123: 55–63.
4. Kačerauskas, T.; Schinello, S. 2025. 'The Role of Digital Innovation in Fostering Sustainability: A Lithuanian Comparative Case Study of Public and Private Museums', *Sustainability* 17(24): 11297.
5. Xiao, T.; Fuso Nerini, F.; Matthews, H. D.; Tavoni, M.; You, F. 2025. 'Environmental Impact and Net-zero Pathways for Sustainable Artificial Intelligence Servers in the USA', *Nature Sustainability* 8: 1541–1553.

EDVARDAS RIMKUS

Dirbtinis intelektas filosofijos, sociologijos ir komunikacijos požiūriu

Santrauka

Straipsnyje aptariamos pagrindinės idėjos, išsakytos mokslinėje konferencijoje apie dirbtinį intelektą (DI), kuris buvo nagrinėtas filosofijos, sociologijos ir komunikacijos požiūriu. DI negali būti laikomas vien siaura technine ar kompiuterių mokslo tema, nes jo plėtra kelia esminius klausimus apie žmogaus proto prigimtį, jo pažintinius gebėjimus, kūrybiškumą, visuomenės raidą. Konferencijoje skaityti pranešimai atskleidžia ne tik DI atveriamas naujas galimybes žmonijai, bet ir jo keliamas rizikas švietimo, medijų, politikos, karo, meninės kūrybos, socialinės nelygybės, žmogaus savivokos ir kitose srityse. Straipsnyje parodoma, kad DI gebėjimas greitai ir efektyviai atlikti įvairias užduotis dar nereiškia, jog jis gali perimti tai, kas žmogui esmingiausia – supratimą, interpretaciją, vertybines nuostatas, prasmės kūrimą ir atsakingą santykį su kitais žmonėmis, gamtine bei socialine aplinka. Todėl DI plėtra skatina svarstyti ne tik tai, ką technologijos gali atlikti geriau ar greičiau už žmogų, bet ir tai, kas vis dar lieka neperduodama algoritmams: gyva patirtis, kūniškumas, kūrybinė intencija, moralinė atsakomybė ir gebėjimas reflektuoti savo veiksmų prasmę. Straipsnyje teigiama, kad DI turi būti suprantamas ne tik kaip technologinė sistema, bet ir kaip socialinė, kultūrinė bei politinė jėga, pertvarkanti žmogus vertybes ir jo kasdienį gyvenimą. Daroma išvada, kad DI būtina vertinti tarpdisciplininiškai, atsižvelgiant ne tik į inovacijų ar našumo kriterijus, bet ir į jo poveikį žmogui, demokratijai ir prasmingai žmogaus egzistencijai.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: dirbtinis intelektas, filosofija, sociologija, komunikacija, etika, kūryba, medijos, žmogiškoji egzistencija