MODERNITY, AFRO-COOPERATIVISM AND THE CHALLENGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

By

Francis Offor
Department of Philosophy
University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria
Email: offor66@yahoo.com; f.offor@ui.edu.ng

and

Samuel Okwudili Uzoh
Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies
Augustine University, Ilara-Epe, Lagos State, Nigeria
Email: oksams4rel@yahoo.com

Abstract

There is no period in the history of modernity that has witnessed a developmental crisis stemming from the fallouts of the modernity project like ours, and yet, at no other age has African intellectuals and scholars risen to the challenge of modernity by evolving a philosophy of development which is both responsive and answerable to the development questions which modernity raises. One of such questions concern the extent to which Artificial Intelligence (AI) can help achieve integral African development without compromising the integrity of the African personhood. Following from this, philosophers have offered various frameworks upon which the functionality of AI can be understood. Most popular among these frameworks is the modernisation theory which admits of various versions of AI technology in almost all areas of human endeavours. In fact, it is difficult nowadays to find someone who cogitates independently without reliance on the auxiliary of Artificial

Intelligence. Consequently, in education, politics, economics, law, agriculture and religion, we rely on virtual display of data while the absence of persons who are physically present in an event is given little or no consideration. This is the same way the presenter is virtually present while his/her personhood is absent. A challenge then arises concerning how to reconcile the presence and or absence of the presenter and the audience with the personhood of the presenter and the audience. It would appear, therefore, that the use of modern technology like AI, undermines features like personhood, hospitality and communality and in the process, eschews integral human development. This is so because AI appears to de-personalise the presenter and instead, personalises the data as if the data sufficiently substitutes for the personhood of the presenter. This essay presents Afro-cooperativism as a response to the onslaughts of Artificial Intelligence on the African notions of personhood, hospitality and communality which promoted integral development in traditional Africa. To achieve this, the essay employs the philosophical methods of phenomenology, hermeneutics and analysis. This essay recommends that development can be attained in Africa using Artificial Intelligence only if modernity integrates those virtuous principles ingrained in the Afro-cooperative Philosophy of Development.

Keywords: Modernity, Artificial Intelligence, Development, Afro-cooperativism

Introduction

With the famous Cartesian dictum *Cogito ergo sum* – 'I think therefore I am' (Lawhead, 2002: 321), we come to terms with the reality of the cognitive capacity of the thinking self. The thinking self thus becomes the 'ground' of existence "of things that are that they are and of things that are not that they are not" (Lawhead, 2002: 31). It becomes the grand totalising principle through, in and with whom the

totality of reality derives its meaning. To this extent, the thinking self would not be lost in the fluidity and anonymity of the extended world, but rather exists as 'the lord and possessor of nature'. In this regard, the recorded account of the creation of the world in the Christian literature becomes essential:

> Let us make man in our own image, in the likeness of ourselves and let them be masters of the fish of the sea, the birds of heaven, the cattle, all the wild animals and all the creatures that creep along the ground. God blessed them saying to them, "be fruitful, multiply, fill the earth and subdue it. Be masters of the fish of the sea, the birds of heaven and all the living creatures that move on the earth." God also said "Look, to you I give all the seed-bearing plants everywhere on the surface of the earth, and the entire tree with seed-bearing fruit; this will be your food" (Genesis 1: 26-29).

It is on this imperative, according to the Christian scripture, that man's dominance over nature is grounded. Indeed, the thinking self is no other than man in whose nature it is to think. This natural capacity of man to think has over the years unveiled high level of dynamism which "culminated in the scientific explosion of the 17th and 18th centuries" (Izunwa, 2011: 143). And by the dawn of the 21st century, major scientific revolutions and technological innovations have taken the center stage in all areas of human affairs - health, business, education, sports, religion, politics and so on, and driving these humanistic endeavours is Artificial Intelligence (AI) which started to gain popularity only after the invention of the computer in the 1940s. It was discovered during this period that "the capability of the computer goes beyond numerical calculations to multifarious intellectual tasks. Although, AI is understood as computer systems that are similar to the human mind - a form of abstraction of the human mind which imitates how the person would interact with his

environment, yet, it cannot be said to be identical to a human mind in all aspects (Wang, 2019).

With the increasing impacts of modern science and technology on the information super highways which foregrounds the increasing demands of AI in almost all areas of human endeavours, the presence of the human agency in our era is fast eroding. By human agency is meant the conscious affirming, asserting, re-affirming and responsible human person which ordinarily should be brought to bear even in a technological environment in order to manifest the human presence. As Hadot rightly corroborates "man will [always] seek [even] through technology to affirm his power, domination and rights over nature" (Hadot, 2008: 92). Indeed, while man through the affirmation of his power, domination and right over modern science and technology has been built, absolutised and consolidated, man has also through the same process been debased to the point of absence. This absence constitutes a great threat to African personhood, hospitality and communality which are fundamental aspects of Afro-cooperative philosophy of development.[1] Afro-cooperativism is a fundamental philosophical framework that contributes to the debate on African development by adopting indigenous African episteme as reflected in interpersonal relationships in the various aspects of lived experience in Africa such as healthcare, security, politics, sports and environment. This essay examines the extent to which the Afro-cooperative philosophy of development can withstand the onslaught of AI while still retaining its core values of personality, hospitality and communality.

Modernity and Its Features

The word 'modernity' is a derivative of the term 'modern' which is gotten from the Latin adverb *modo* (meaning 'presently', 'just now'), and was employed in the 5th and 6th century CE to distinguish the Christian era of the Later Roman Empire from the Pagan era of the Greco-Roman world. In fact, the Roman historian and statesman Cassiodorus was the first writer to use the term 'modern' in the 6th

century CE, to refer to his own age (*O'Donnell, 1979: 235)*. However, the word entered wide usage in the context of the 17th-century debate between the Ancients and the Moderns over which between Modern culture and Classical (Græco–Roman) culture was superior. Ever since, scholars have used the term 'modern' to describe both a historical period like the post-medieval European period as well as the Euro-American culture or the ensemble of particular socio-cultural norms, attitudes and practices that arose during the 17th and 18th-century Enlightenment period. Let us pause to recall the slight difference in the usage of the terms 'modern', 'modernisation' and 'modernity' even though some use them interchangeably. Modernisation refers to the process - a transition from traditional to modern societies. Modernity is the result, outcome or end-state of this process. Modernity thus refers to the cultural, social, and economic atmosphere developed after this transformation. This level of social existence was made possible by certain developments, one of which is the emergence of the modern nation-state, which with its centralised power structure, clearly defined borders and sovereignty was able to manage diverse aspects of life. There was also a sense of shared identity among the citizens, often fostered through language, culture, and national symbols. Also, modernity would not have been conceivable without the Industrial Revolution which reshaped societies from agrarian economies to industrial powerhouses, resulting in mass production, urbanisation, and profound changes in the social fabric. Finally, democracy with its ideas about equality, and human rights fostered social progress and inclusion. The democratic process, with its elections, representative government, and rule of law brought political power to the people, and this became an impetus for modernity. Thus, while modernity is used to describe a wide range of interrelated historical processes and cultural phenomena, it can also refer to the subjective or existential experience of the conditions they produce, and their ongoing impact on human culture, institutions, and politics (*Berman, 2010)*. By the

late 19th and 20th centuries, pervading features of modernity have come to dominate the art, politics, science and culture of not only Western Europe and North America, but of almost every populated area on the globe. Such features include:

- industrialisation
- the development of individualism and urbanization (*Hroch and Hollan, 1998)*
- the rise of mercantilism and capitalism (*Goody, 2013)*
- increasing role of science and technology and a belief in the possibilities of political progress (*Almond et.al, 1982 and Olsen, Pedersen and Hendricks, 2009)*
- naturalist approaches to art and description, and a growing disenfranchisement in the authority of religion in public and private life
- evolutionary thinking in geology, biology, politics, and social sciences, and
- emancipation

Thus, modernity was not just about socio-political, economic and scientific changes; it also involved dramatic shifts in thought. Modernity brought a series of seemingly indisputable benefits to people such as lower infant mortality rate, decreased death from starvation, eradication of some of the fatal diseases, more equal treatment of people with different backgrounds and incomes, and so on. To some, the potential of modernity is, perhaps, yet to be fully realised. However, there are also a number of dark sides to modernity, most especially in the areas of technological development, biotechnology, genetic engineering, medicine, agriculture and the military. Besides these, there are also psychological and moral hazards such as alienation (resulting from extreme individualism), feeling of rootlessness, loss of strong bonds and common values and of human dignity. Some have even suggested that the end result of modernity is the loss of a stable conception of humanity and/or the human being.

From Intelligence to Artificial Intelligence (AI)

The word *intelligence* is derived from the Latin noun *intellēctus*, which means to comprehend or to understand. The term intelligence has been long-studied in humans, and across numerous disciplines and it has been used to describe the very general mental capability that, among other things, involves the ability to reason, plan, solve problems, think abstractly, comprehend complex ideas, learn quickly and learn from experience. It has been used to describe man's capacity for abstraction, for understanding, for self-awareness, for learning, for emotional knowledge, for reasoning and for thinking. David Wechsler describes intelligence as the aggregate or global capacity of the individual to act purposefully, to think rationally, and to deal effectively with his environment (Wechsler, 1944), while for Reuven Feuerstein, Intelligence is "the unique propensity of human beings to change or modify the structure of their cognitive functioning to adapt to the changing demands of a life situation" (Feuerstein et.al, 2002).Although humans have been the primary focus of intelligence, researchers and scientists have also attempted to investigate animal intelligence, or more broadly, animal cognition, as evidence of a general factor of intelligence is claimed to have been observed in non-human animals. Some have even argued for plants to be included in the class of entity classified as intelligent based on their ability to sense and model external and internal environments and adjust their morphology, physiology and phenotype accordingly, to ensure self-preservation and reproduction (Trewavas, 2005 and Trewavas, 2005: 841).

It is this gradual extension of the concept to non-human animals and plants that caught the fancy of some scholars who then proposed definitions of intelligence to accommodate machines. Basically, intelligence is a fundamental distinguishing feature and an essential attribute of human beings. When therefore the concept is to be applied to non-human objects, it has to be an abstraction from humans and

this makes it an imitation of the natural intellectual activities of humans. This new dimension to the meaning of intelligence, that is, intelligence as possessed by machines, is what is referred to as artificial intelligence (AI), defined by Kaplan and Haenlein as "a system's ability to correctly interpret external data, to learn from such data, and to use those learnings to achieve specific goals and tasks through flexible adaptation" (Kaplan and Haelein, 2019). Intelligence is a conscious activity performed only by beings who possess consciousness. It is entirely anthropocentric and this anthropocentricity of intelligence is a perfect indicator of the formal, formative and performative nature of human intelligence which informs the artificiality of intelligence associated with machines and artifacts.

The emergence of artificial intelligence is no doubt traceable to the modernist agenda where it was meant to serve the purpose of utilitarian and consumerist societies, but this new form of intelligence is devoid of the human agency, as it does not depend on human specific properties, which can be psychological, biological, historical, social, etc (Wang, 2019: 4). This form of intelligence was affirmed in the 1940s as soon as it was discovered that machines not only carry out numerical calculation but also human-like intelligent tasks. Consequently, a new nomenclature "giant electronic brains" (Wang, 2019: 7), started gaining popularity among researchers like Mulloch and Pitts (1943), Wiener (1948), Shannon and Weaver (1949), Turing (1950) and Von Neumann (1958). These researchers view AI as indicating the same scope of intelligence as seen in human action; since AI for them, displays behaviour appropriate to the ends of the system and adaptive to the demands of the environment which can occur within some limits of speed and complexity (Newell and Simon, 1976). AI is no doubt the realisation of the vision of modernisation in which human intelligence evolves to meet the demands of modern technology. AI is thus a version of intelligence which has as its end, the mechanisation of human activities. Since

modernity demands an increase and/or multiplication of work output, then AI represents what man would do in keeping with modernity. The large scale participation of modern societies in attaining a globalised economy, politics, education, sports, etc., is dependent on the auxiliary of AI. This led Tegmac, who in his work, *Life 3.0: Being Human in the Age of Artificial Intelligence, to declare that life occurs in three stages: Life 1.0, Life 2.0 and Life 3.0. According to Tegmac,*

> *Life 3.0* is the AI which can design and upgrade both its software and hardware. It can replicate itself from scratch and build new bodies relatively quickly from raw materials, plus, it can also learn from its surroundings, gather and store information from raw materials, learn from the past to avoid mistakes, enabling it to advance enormously and to transform itself more directly and quickly than our creativity enables us to do. In this sense, *Life 3.0* is the master of its own destiny and, when created, will represent the technological evolution of life (Tegmark, 2017: 512).

Today, AI has become a new stage of human development and a meta-paradigm upon which everything is discussed, interpreted and analysed. It has become the yardstick for determining intelligence, efficiency and performance in almost all aspects of human endeavor, straddling the academia, business organisations, financial institutions, sports, and other facets of society. In fact, it has become the new foundation of modern society and "the driving force behind many local and regional policies" (Giddens, 1990). Anthony Giddens uses the phrase "radicalised modernity" to describe this phase of human development.

Discourse on Artificial Intelligence in African Philosophy

Discourses on Artificial Intelligence can be found in many of the

literature on African Philosophy. In their work titled "*Artificial intelligence and the implication for a Ziibalogzii's worldview: The contentions and alternatives",* Deezia and Kilani (2023) posited what can be framed as the Alienation thesis which was derived from their conceptual analysis of personhood-*Ziibalogzii.* The Zibalogzii, according to Deezia and Kilani, is "a life force philosophy which portrays the state of being human in an interconnected web, seeing reality in terms of a universe of forces interlinked together, and that are in constant interplay with one another. This interplay, therefore, enhances a kind of relationality which cherishes the humanity, right, integrity and dignity of others." (Deezia, 2023:269). On this note, the alienation thesis claims that the emergence of AI in the modern context, which featured the advanced production from machinery and technology, subjected the human person to "negation or privation of the essence of being, thereby denying the actualisation of inherent potentials in human beings." Thus, they argue that the modern era is "an era of alienation of humans from themselves, by leading them to attribute their own nature, which is inter-subjective, to a non-human agent whose essences are opposed to the complementarity, reciprocity, collaborativity and relational communality associated with the human person." (Deezia, 2023:270). Despite having enhanced production and contributed to progress in various spheres of modern society such as economy, agriculture, human resource management, communication and media, Artificial Intelligence seems to lack a consciousness of the subjectivity of the other. It rather views the other person as an object having the same features as it does and as being a non-conscious collaborator. Of course, this resonates the reductionistic-analytic orientation of the Western supremacist relationship with the Africans in the era of colonialism. Senghor has portrayed this orientation in his popular philosophy of Negritude. Unfortunately, the alienation thesis of Deezia and Kilani seem to ignore the supremacist content in their analysis of Ziibalogzii.

Another important contribution in the AI discourse from the African

perspective is the anthropocentric thesis of Thaddeus Metz. In his "An African theory of moral status: A Relational Alternative to Individualism and Holism", Metz (2012) argues that the anthropocentric features such as (i) the capacity for communality and (ii) the enhanced capacity to be objects, are capable of identifying other humans as opposed to other sorts of entity. With these features, the argument that AI could be persons is strongly opposed. More importantly, Metz's thesis is an African communitarian account which for the most part, portrays the Africans as persons in the sense that "they are disposed to feel a sense of togetherness with, and have emotional reactions towards other beings with whom they identify and with whom they feel solidarity" (Metz, 2012: 58), features that are clearly beyond the capacity of AI.

In his "Artificial intelligence and African conceptions of personhood" C. S. Wareham (2020) explores the question of whether AI could have the high degree of moral status that is attributed to human persons, by examining African conceptions of personhood and their implications for the possibility of AI persons. He focuses on an African account of personhood (which he refers to as 'threshold personhood') which seems inimical to the idea that AI could ever be 'persons' in the sense typically attributed to humans. The author then explores a more comprehensive African-inspired account of moral status, according to which attribution of highest moral status to humans stems from capacities for mutual recognition as both objects and subjects of harmonious relationships. Following from this point, the author argues that AI could be regarded as persons with equivalent moral status, though with some significant implications, and that AI ethics research should begin to consider or provide an indication of how we might begin to welcome such entities into communal relations of identity and solidarity in ways that may be different, but analogous to the ways in which we welcome new human persons. The foregoing essays and many others go a long way to show that the discourse on Artificial Intelligence is not bereft of contributions from

the African philosophical tradition.

Artificial Intelligence and Human Presence

AI operates based on its alleged understanding of the objects in its environment and the task it is required to perform. We can glean from this that intelligence is meant to be at the core of the activities of the AI and that AI is intelligent to the extent to which it carries out certain tasks for which it has been programmed. Yet, AI is programmed by an intelligent being - the human person - who understands the needs of those in his/her environment at every given time and who relates efficiently and effectively with others to actualise those needs. This relatedness is an inherent feature of intelligent beings and it is what defines the human person. According to Odimegwu, "It is in the relatedness of my being that I gain the possibility and/or feel the necessity to strive to define and achieve the particularity and unity of my being a self in the community" (Odimegwu, 2005: 157). In fact, to be a person is to be able to relate with other persons as persons and not as objects, yet AI relates with other persons not as persons but as objects. This is simply because AI is not aware of the fact that one is a being with freewill, choice (even the choice to discard it and manufacture machines that will help carry out other tasks), language, self-determination, self-consciousness and intentionality. It is programmed to quickly respond to the puzzles one presents to it but may not be conversant with the next puzzle. It responds swiftly to one's present situation which one presents to it, but may not respond to one's next situation which may result from the present. In fact, the capacity to device the method of transmitting information to next generations is yet to be attained and the possibility of attaining this capacity is yet to be determined by AI. AI is only present to what one presents to it but absent to what one is yet to present to it, meaning that it only operates at the level of the physics and physical manifestation of the cognitive capacities of an individual. We are yet to get the version of AI that will serve the spiritual and/or metaphysical purpose(s) of the human person who basically consists of both the

physical as well as the metaphysical qualities. Particularly, person in the African ontology is a composite of manifold, sentient and transcendent reality bound to space-time, but who also transcends space-time boundaries because of its divine origin. For Tempels, the African person (*muntu*) can be understood both vertically and horizontally. From a vertical plane of reference, the African person is

> …the dominant force. His force, his life, his fullness of being consists in his participation to a greater or less extent in the force of God…And therefore, man, in Bantu thought, although in a circumscribed sense than God, is a causal force of life (Tempels, 1959).

This definition, according to Tempels, goes no further than to describe the relationships that man can have with his environment, without explaining ultimately his essential being. The metaphysical nature of the African person does not extricate him from his environment, which for the most part, consists of both human and non-human beings. If therefore the metaphysical dimension of the African person determines the manner with which he relates with his environment, then it means that his relationship with AI (which is not totally disconnected from him and his environment) is determined by the African person's metaphysical orientation. AI as indicated earlier is part of the human person as it is meant to mimic human intelligence. This immediately inaugurates the mode of relationality of the African person in the horizontal plane of reference. While the African person relates with his environment and all that is in it, he prioritizes his relationship with other persons to the extent that he exists with, by, for and through others. Mbiti elaborates further,

> In traditional life, the individual does not and cannot exist alone except corporately. He owes his existence to other people, including those of past generations and his contemporaries. He is simply part of the whole. The community must therefore make, create,

> or produce the individual; for the individual depends on the corporate group…Whatever happens to the individual happens to the whole group, and whatever happens to the whole group happens to the individual. The individual can only say: "I am, because we are; and since we are therefore I am." This is a cardinal point in the understanding of the African view of man (Mbiti, 1969: 108-109).

What the above suggests is that the use of Artificial Intelligence within the context of modernity, portrays the African person losing its presence to others. This is because what AI presents is a bizarre form of personhood in which the person appears to be present but in reality is absent. In the process, we find that the bonds of personality, hospitality and communality that existed in almost all aspects of African life and being and which engendered development in traditional Africa, are being ruined by the overarching presence and use of AI. The extent to which Africa can attain integral development within the context of modernity using AI, while still retaining these virtues remains a puzzle to be solved.

Afro-cooperativism and the Challenge of Artificial Intelligence

Afro-cooperativism also known as Afro-cooperative Philosophy of development is a strand of African Relational Philosophy developed as an overarching fundamental philosophical framework for development in sub-Saharan Africa. It claims that knowledge exists as a shared horizon of cognition, perceptions, beliefs, values, visions and experiences, determined by the principles of self-identity, hospitality and relationality. Hence, it is a new model of development discourse founded on an epistemology of non-coercive social cohesion. It claims that through a shared horizon of epistemic principles inherent in individuals, crystallised in cognition, perceptions, beliefs, skills, attitudes, visions and values, development can be realised. To this extent, it improves on the

question of the dichotomy between the individual and community as seen in radical communitarianism. For instance, in the Nigerian socio-economic context, adopting the philosophy of Afro-cooperativism will create an enabling environment for solidarity, inter-ethnic, inter-party and interreligious dialogue. To a large extent, the individualist and/or capitalist orientation will be displaced by the Afro-cooperative orientation geared towards inclusion, especially in areas of policy making, economic planning, budget, rule of law, constitutional review, party politics, educational programmes and other spheres of Nigerian democracy. Particularly, Afro-cooperativism takes cognisance of the inherent epistemic systems in African cultures and strives to infuse them in our educational system in order to give our education an indigenous colouration and outlook. In the process, our educational policy will be geared towards the kind of development that will be both responsible and responsive to the African reality. By and large, Afro-cooperativism is a contribution to development discourses in Africa. It is a chapter in the pages of literature on the relevance of indigenous epistemic framework for various aspects of the African *lebenswelt* and *weltanschauung* (life-world and worldview) manifested in healthcare, security, political administration, economics and econometrics, development policy and environmental planning amongst others.

However, the AI technology tends to blur the realisation of the Afro-cooperative principles of personhood, hospitality and communality in modern day Africa. In fact, the very idea of AI shows that there is a de-Africanisation agenda that reduces the essence and presence of the African person who is involved in the process of cooperation. The fundamental questions however concern the extent to which AI can be said to protect the African personhood; the extent to which Africa can genuinely develop through AI oriented cooperation and the sustainability of the development that stems from this cooperation. Cooperation here simply means 'to work with', and 'working with' for us suggests a deeper level of inter-subjectivity whereby both agents at

work understand their perceptions, beliefs, feelings, expectations and intentions. In fact, to cooperate involves a whole process of manifesting these mental phenomena. By and large, a reduced or imitational display of these mental phenomena as seen in AI has far-reaching implications for moral responsibility and for development generally. For instance, the fact that AI cannot be punished when in error or rewarded with cash or kind gifts for its efficiency, accuracy or effectiveness shows that it cannot be consciously involved in the process of cooperation. And, since Afro-cooperativism is a philosophy of integral human development, it follows that AI is a potential threat to Afro-cooperativism as a fundamental philosophical framework for development in sub-Saharan Africa.

The challenge that AI technology poses to the hospitality content of Afro-cooperativism is also very glaring. Hospitality as an essential virtue of Afro-cooperativism refers to the showing of empathy by an individual or society to a person who could be a member of such society either by blood or by affiliation. This act of hospitality emanates from a deep level of social consciousness of the condition of a suffering or unfortunate individual. The philosophy of Afro-cooperativism maintains that the kind gesture shown to such individual is non-coercive. No one compels one to offer a helping hand. In fact, whatever is responsible for the act of hospitality is the fact that one is socially conscious, as not having a social consciousness amounts to non-existence. Social consciousness leads to a non-coercive social cohesion. And, because the suffering individual at this point is incapacitated to cooperate, the society responds to his/her challenges promptly by being hospitable. This act of hospitality indicates that the society or the individual (who is a member of the society) is present to the suffering person and the suffering person feels the presence of the carer. In this wise, *presencing* becomes the metaphysical grounding of the hospitality content of Afro-cooperativism. According to Odimegwu,

> *Presencing* refers to the capacity of the human person to effect the presence of being, i.e to cause being to become present to being. Taking off from the presenting self or locus of presence, it operates in three dimensions and thereby creates three relations of presence: the presence of other beings to me; the presence of other persons to me; the presence of myself to me (Odimegwu, 2005: 157).

This metaphysical concept of presencing is well encapsulated in the Igbo adage *Onye aghana nwanne ya* which means "One should not abandon one's kin" or "one should always be present to the needs of one's kin." It is, therefore, difficult for AI which relates with other persons, not as persons but as objects, to guarantee such manner of hospitality as portrayed in Afro-cooperativism. Even if AI offers any help or displays any act of cooperation or hospitality, it is only doing so not consciously but because it was programmed to do so. And as Geoffrey Jefferson rightly remarked in his 1949 Lister Oration, that is, acceptance speech for his 1948 award of Lister medal, "not until a machine can write a sonnet or compose a concerto because of thoughts and emotions felt, and not by the chance fall of symbols, could we agree that machine equals brain" (Jefferson, 1949). Such intelligence displayed by AI eschews vital features about humans that would foster integral development. A development-oriented intelligence must indicate an optimum expression of humanity and this is what Artificial Intelligence does not possess. This makes Artificial Intelligence the most excruciating challenge to the successful application of the Afrocentric based development models in this era of modernity.

Conclusion

The AI technology is a great contribution of modernity to all aspects of human existence, most especially with its knack to make work

faster with fascinating results. Today, it is difficult to find someone who cogitates independently without reliance on the auxiliary of Artificial Intelligence. Complementing this is the globalisation phenomenon which has tried to "reduce the spatio-temporal gap separating different states of the world" (Badru, 2004) and, sustain "the multiplicity of linkages and interconnections that transcend the nation-state (and by implication the societies) which make up the modern world system..." (McGrew, 1992). Yet, in the face of this global development enthused by the AI technology, humanity is largely experiencing an absence, in the sense of persons being absent to themselves and to others, but yet present to others through Artificial Intelligence. The African is lost in the face of this trending technology as he/she not only compromises his/her identity and enormous communal values, but still remains underdeveloped or pseudo-developed at the end of the day. While the traditional conviviality characteristic of the average African life is compromised because each member is present to his gadget and absent to one another, cooperation of the African ilk which adulates the humanity of the African is practically challenged. At length, we are left in an existential dilemma of either holding on to the AI technology and be absent to ourselves and to our humanity or to jettison Artificial Intelligence and go back to our days of yore! Of course, not to choose from these options is itself a choice. And, what is the choice? To seek for an African model of AI that would tilt towards the Afro-cooperativist's endeavour.

Notes

1. Afro-cooperative Philosophy of Development is a scholarly perspective in existing frameworks on African Philosophy of Development.

References

Almond Gabriel Abraham, Chodorow Marvin; Pearce and Roy Harvey (1982), Progress and its discontents, California: University of California Press.

Badru, O. (2004), Thinking about globalisation, in Asiegbu, M., and Agbakoba, J.A., (eds.), *Philosophy and praxis in Africa,* Ibadan: Hope Publications.

Berman, Marshall (2010), All that is Solid Melts into air: the Experience of Modernity, London and Brooklyn: Verso, pp. 15–36.

Deezia, B. S., & Kilani, A. O. (2023). *Artificial Intelligence and the Implication for a Ziibalogzii's Worldview: the Contentions and Alternatives*. *Jos Journal of Religion and Philosophy, 4*(2).

Feuerstein, R. (1990), The Theory of Structural Modifiability, in B. Presseisen (ed.), *Learning and Thinking Styles: Classroom Interaction*, Washington, DC: National Education Associations.

Feuerstein R., Feuerstein S., Falik, L & Rand, Y. (2002), *Dynamic assessments of cognitive modifiability*, Israel, Jerusalem: ICELP Press.

Giddens, A. (1990), *The Consequences of Modernity,* New York: Polity Press.

Goody, Jack. (2013), Capitalism and modernity: the great debate, USA: Wiley.

Hadot, P. (2008), *The Veil of Isis: an Essay on the History of the Idea of Nature*, Trans. Michael Chase; Cambridge, MA.: Belknap/Harvard University Press.

Hroch, Jaroslav and Hollan, David (1998), National, Cultural, and Ethnic Identities: Harmony beyond Conflict, Washington,

DC: Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.

Ihde, Don (2009), Technology and Politics, in Olsen Jan Kyrre Berg, Pedersen Stig Andur and Hendricks Vincent F. (eds.), A Companion to the Philosophy of Technology, USA: Wiley.

Izunwa, M. (2011), Impact of Science and Scientific Worldview on Man: a Critical Review*, Ogirisi: A New Journal of African Studies*, Vol. 8.

Jefferson, Geoffrey (1949), The Mind of Mechanical Man, *British Medical Journal*, 1 (4616): 1105-1110.

Kaplan Andreas and Haelein Michael (2019), Siri, Siri, in my hand: Who's the fairest in the land? On the interpretations, illustrations, and implications of artificial intelligence, Business Horizons, 62 (1).

Mbiti, J.S. (1969), *African Religions and Philosophy*, USA: Heinemann.

McGrew, T. (1992), A global society, in Hall, S., Held, D. and McGrew, T. (eds.), *Modernity and its futures*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Metz, T. (2012), An African Theory of Moral Status: a Relational Alternative to Individualism and Holism. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 15 (3): 387-402.

Newell, A. and Simon, H. A. (1976), Computer Science as Empirical Inquiry: Symbols and Search. *Communications of the ACM,* 19(3):113–126.

New Jerusalem Bible.

Odimegwu, I. (2005), The human person in African Thought: Existential Crises and Conceptual Resolutions, *OGIRISI: A New Journal of African Studies,* Vol. 30.

O'Donnell, James J. (1979), Cassiodorus, Berkeley, California:

University of California Press.

Saftic, I. (2017), Book Review of Max Tegmark's *Life 3.0: Being Human in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*, New York: Random House–Knopf, 2017, 543.

Tempels, P. (1959), *Bantu Philosophy*. Colin King, Paris: Presence Africaine.

Trewavas, A. (2002), Mindless Mastery, Nature. ***415*** *(6874).*

_____. *(2005), Green Plants as Intelligent Organisms, Trends in Plant Science.* ***10*** *(9): 413–419.*

Wareham, C. S. (2021), Artificial intelligence and African conceptions of personhood, *Ethics and Information Technology.* 23: 127-136.

Wang, P. (2019), On Defining Artificial Intelligence, *Journal of Artificial General Intelligence* 10(2): 1-37.

Wechsler, D. (1944), The Measurement of Adult Intelligence. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.

William F. Lawhead (2002) *The Voyage of Discovery: a Historical Introduction to Philosophy*, USA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.