



The Relevance of Prabhat Ranjan Sarkar's Neo-Humanism in the Era of Artificial Intelligence

Author- Shyam Sundar Sarkar

Assistant Professor.

Dept. Of Philosophy

Ramthakur College. Agartala, Tripura.

Abstract-

The rapid development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has brought profound changes to human society, transforming economic systems, education, governance, healthcare, and everyday life. Alongside its benefits, AI raises serious ethical, social, and philosophical concerns such as dehumanization, algorithmic bias, surveillance, unemployment, and the erosion of moral responsibility. In this context, the Neo-Humanism propounded by Prabhat Ranjan Sarkar offers a comprehensive ethical and spiritual framework capable of guiding technological progress toward holistic human welfare. This paper examines the relevance of Sarkar's Neo-Humanism in the era of Artificial Intelligence by analyzing its philosophical foundations, ethical principles, and universal outlook. Using an analytical and interdisciplinary approach, the study explores how Neo-Humanism can address contemporary challenges posed by AI, emphasizing rational morality, universal love, spiritual consciousness, and socio-economic justice. The paper argues that Neo-Humanism provides a human-centered yet universal ethical paradigm that can harmonize technological innovation with moral responsibility, social equity, and sustainable development. The study concludes that P. R. Sarkar's Neo-Humanism remains highly relevant in the AI era as a guiding philosophy for responsible, inclusive, and value-based technological advancement.

Keywords: P. R. Sarkar, Neo-Humanism, Artificial Intelligence, Ethics of Technology, Human Values.

Introduction

The rapid acceleration in the development of AI has brought about a significant transformation in the firmament of contemporary societies. AI now mediates economic production as processes of automated decision-making, predictive analytics, generative technologies, and autonomous machines engage in governance, healthcare, education, and interaction between persons. And in this respect while promising reliable solutions for efficiency, innovation, and economic growth, it raises serious questions of ethics and meaning. Studies on AI and ethical issues show that the major threats facing the present AI world consist of algorithmic bias, mass surveillance, erosion of privacy, displacement of human labour, amassing of technology-power centralization, and escalating dehumanization of social relations. Consequently, ethical matrices extant today-utilitarianism, deontological ethics, or techno-optimistic humanism-frequently fall short of delineating with the nexus between technology, morality, and human consciousness within complex real-world situations. This lacuna of utility gives rise to an ever-stronger interest in realizing contemporary philosophical studies oriented towards non-modern ethical traditions that metaphysically extend from the human to the ecological orientation of ethical rationality, as well; Neo-Humanism is one of them. Neo-Humanism, as an interpretation of human life struggling beyond anthropocentrism, aims to develop what preserves human dignity, which is universal ethics, rational morality, and spiritual consciousness.

Aims & Objectives:

To consider the relevance of Sarkar's Neo-Humanism in the context of Artificial Intelligence. The objectives for the current paper are:

- (i) To elaborate the philosophical origins and ethical standards of Neo-Humanism,
- (ii) To examine the ethical and social challenges raised by AI, and
- (iii) To consider how Neo-Humanism can be a foundational strand in forming a universal ethics directed towards embodying the interests of humanity in responsible technological development.

The paper contributes to the existing literature by its ability to examine Neo-Humanism in the discourse of debates on AI ethics and its broader application beyond its original socio-philosophical context.

Methodology:

This study uses qualitative analysis and an inter-disciplinary research approach in which primary sources of data are the published works of Prabhat R. Sarkar, notably presenting his works on Neo-Humanism, Ethics, and Socio Economic Philosophy. Secondary sources include peer reviewed journal articles, books and policy literature on AI ethics, technology and society, and recent moral philosophies. A comparative analytical method has been employed to compare the entities between Neo-Humanism and influential frameworks of AI ethics. Conceptual analysis was sought to interpret in simple words key philosophical categories like rational morality, universalism, spiritual humanism that respond to institutional transformations driven by AI. Neither original nor fabricated data were actually used. Rather, this was an investigation that had only theoretical and interpretative objectives.

Philosophical Foundations of Neo-Humanism

Neo-humanism emerged as the critical successor to classical humanism, thus preserving at least one dimension of the ethical landscape while coping with its historical limitations. The humanism of the past, especially that of the Enlightenment, was characterized by a complete dedication to human reason, dignity, and autonomy within political and social spaces. Although these are commendable for challenging religious dogma and authoritarianism, Prabhat Ranjan Sarkar claims for an almost insurmountable resistance to expansion since they are, in his view, supervised with narrow constraints revolving around mere anthropocentrism and qualified socio-cultural parochialism. Traditional humanism, by privileging particular groups, cultures, or civilizations -- using a largely-suspect universal under the hegemony of reason -- thus sought to swell the folds of genuine universality.

Neo-Humanism beyond the human species proposes barring all living beings. It places a universal perspective rooted in reason, feeling, and spiritual awareness. Instead of rejecting humanism altogether, Neo-Humanism reconstitutes it by locating human beings within the broader fabric of life reinforcement. Social responsibility thus passes beyond private human relationships and extends instead to animals, vegetation, ecosystems, and coming generations. There is a need for the establishment of new moral fronts at a juncture when technology has gone too far beyond her interests in both social and ecological systems.

Within the Neo-Humanist philosophy, rational morality holds a central role. In conceptual terms, Sarkar viewed this rational morality as an ethical orientation that would not depend on an opaque tradition or be guided by emotional instincts left unexamined, but would essentially be critical reasoning oriented toward the collective welfare. For Sarkar, moral principles need to be continuously re-evaluated in reference to variable material, social, and technological conditions. Rational morality thus avoids absolutism and moral relativism. Instead, it provides a dynamic if principled approach that deals with the complex challenges of the present, including those potentially presented by AI.

Emphasis on spiritual awakening is equally fundamental in Neo-Humanism. International spiritualization is not identical with institutional obedience or theological doctrine. Rather, it is the purposeful diffusion of consciousness that enables people to widen themselves in the generic sense, loving unconditionally. Within the philosophy of Neo-Humanism, spiritual consciousness founds the most powerful grounding for ethical commitment. Practice of values and expression of spiritual consciousness, seen as moral values in the interaction of Neo-Humanism, strengthen ethical commitment through self-restraint, moral discrimination, and empathic understanding. The inclusion of rational ethics in spiritual consciousness sets Neo-Humanism apart from secular moral theories that are more normally grounded on instrumental rationality. This synthesis offers Neo-Humanism incomparable extra respect in addressing ethics issues when advanced technologies tend to go alongside obvious limitations in rationality.

Ethical Challenges in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

In the wake of AI's swift global spread, ethical dilemmas nowadays transcend mere questions of technical proficiency and economic result. Algorithmic systems are increasingly playing the dominant role in determining who will and will not gain access to employment, credit, education, healthcare, and other public services; however, often, they tend to reproduce and even accentuate the pre-existing forms of marginalization. Their biased training data, handle-variable assumptions, and like move toward narrow algorithmic choices that themselves present a palpable moral hazard to society. They do not just hamper technology; they project enlargeable structures of surfacing discrimination already in motion, exposing the wider ethical challenges concerning socio-technical systems. AI-powered surveillance systems are essentially adding up to this moral maze: in their wake lies increased facial recognition and biometric tracking at the hands of the state and corporate power affecting lack of legal oversight or consent from the community. This presents contradictions to the privacy rights and civil liberties but with a possibility of misuse, warning of an immediate threat to democratic accountability. Again, predictive policing and algorithmic governance run the heightened propensity for affirming systemic injustice through encoding the different historical biases directly into automated decision frameworks, which concern public trust over democratic institutions.

AI-driven automation has some major socio-economic problems. If technological innovation places greater productivity as an incentive, it also encourages the layoffs; deskilling of labor, and deeper unequal incomes have been witnessed. The gains from growth spurred by AI are regularly concentrated in a handful of corporations and technologically advanced regions vaster inequities in global and domestic contexts. Such circumstances negate and challenge the prevailing social order, thereby requiring new ethical frameworks that can unite innovation and social justice. On a more subtle level, radical advancements in AI disrupt traditional notions of moral agency and accountability. As decisions are given more and more to autonomous or semi-autonomous systems, responsibility will become fragmented among programmers, data providers, corporate organizations, and institutional formulas. When responsibility diffuses, the situation then becomes devoid of ethics, making the attribution of blame or moral accountability extremely elusive. With the diminishing presence of ethics, this situation leads to an ever-growing risk of neglecting justice at the cost of efficiency and optimization considerations, thereby exposing human dignity to injury and injustice.

Neo-Humanism and Rational Morality in AI Ethics

Neo-Humanism, through its emphasis on rational morality, has a strong normative standpoint towards addressing this ethical dilemma. Sarkar's insistence on a reflective critical judgment is a direct challenge to the idea of technological determinism – the belief that technological progress must be realized and can be value-neutral; technology may not impose any binding ethical stand. In a Neo-Humanist viewpoint, technology is not an autonomous force; it is a human invention that must remain critically under ethical evaluation and social control.

The ethical imperative to safeguard vulnerable human interests finds a critical locus in AI, demanding not only technical efficiency in terms of correctness, cleverness, and productive output but also social utility in terms of how distributive justice, inclusion, and human dignity are assessed. Neorenaissance ethical muscularity hits against the cushioning orthodoxy of preference utility-based AI-against which even an unjust outcome is justified in the name of net utility and beneficiary welfare. However, it cannot truly be denied that an ordinary consequential framework would be violently exclusive of any minority interests for the sake of presumed majority good. Neo-Humanism should play a vital role in helping AI avoid such kinds of harms originating from bias. It should champion inclusive design criteria for transparency-before-the-fact norms and ethical oversight based on universal features. Notwithstanding all different considerations in giving an agreed-upon moral view of what is an ethically desirable epistemological approach to real AI, there would especially justify per se whenever considering the AI pro inclusiveness.

Universalism Beyond Anthropocentrism

The substantive contribution of the Neo-Humanistic framework to the current discourse in the area of AI ethics is to reject narrow anthropocentrism. As AI systems interact with ecological modules to model the climate, optimize resources, and monitor the environment, the ethical framework must transcend human-centric issues. The universalism of Neo-Humanism provides a philosophical basis for that. It sustains as an argument in favor of highlighting the intrinsic value of all living beings. In this respect, support exists in both thought and discourse around sustainable and responsible AI that calls for environmental accountability and intergenerational justice. To a Neo-Humanist, the relevant technology advancements—those darkening the ecological balance and speeding up environmental destruction—are ethically unacceptable to their present gainful world of value. Thus, the AI development must be measured under the holistic view of an entire ecosystem.

Neo-Humanism goes beyond anthropocentrism to provide a comprehensive evaluation of technological progress. This entails looking at AI as a medium to aid humans in coordination with technology and nature instead of a tool of domination and exploitation.

Spiritual Consciousness and Human-Centered Technology

Sarkar's accent on spiritual consciousness is crucial as government would lead a counter-voice against the mechanistic world paradigm on AI and computational rationality. Although AI systems do a wonderful job in data processing, pattern recognition, and predictive analysis, they do not possess any subjective experiences, empathy, or moral intuition. Neo-Humanism is against subjecting computational intelligence to human wisdom or ethical judgment.

The bifurcation bears a direct import on shaping the philosophical underpinnings toward responsible AI governance; one may well argue for a human-in-the-loop approach, thus ensuring that critical decisions—say in human rights or social justice—remain undeniably a key task for the ethical concerns of humans. Within that delineation, Neo-Humanism attests to the necessity for ethical education and cultivation of moral sensibilities among technologists, policymakers, and users—this could well complement technological excellence with ethical maturity. On the ethical path again, that is within the realm of social and kin cornerstones, Neo-Humanism aspires to provide evidence replete with ethical consciousness, to bind the exercise of technological prowess with responsibility, restraint, and compassion. Neo-Humanism serves as a warning to society that ethical evolution cannot be made into an automated trend, placing moral responsibility on human agents.

Social Justice and Technological Equity

Neo-humanism is rather an essential subset of Sarkar's wider socio-economic blueprint, which corroborates a model of equitable distribution of resources and collective welfare. An associated concern is that in the contemporary economy dominated by AI, power and wealth are increasingly being appropriated within a select few transnational corporations or national governments. This concentration has threatened democratic governance while simultaneously intensifying socio-economic disparity. On the other hand, Neo-Humanism critically challenges such concentration by arguing for decentralized, welfare-oriented models for development and cooperatives. In the arena of AI policies, this emphasis places a premium on open-access knowledge systems, ethical regulation, and inclusive innovation initiatives that empower the marginalised communities-the constituents left out of the benefits, risks, and consequences of AI-and hence envisages AI not just as a profit-making instrument but as a development/social justice enterprise.

Overall, Neo-Humanism is an all-pervasive philosophical system that has been used to direct the artificial intelligence revolution not just towards ethics but for the equity and balanced life. One of the most important reasons why it is relevant in the age of AI is its attempts to integrate presides of rational morality, charitable compassion, spiritual consciousness, and socio-economic justice into a coherent vision of value-led technological growth.

Conclusion

The relevance of Neo-Humanism in the present context has been discussed with the advent of modern-day AI development. The study shows that Neo-Humanism could offer a substantial and extensive framework in terms of ethics and philosophical ideals, which would help address the many dilemmas facing AI. By way of concentrating on rational morality, universalism, spiritual awareness, and socio-economic justice, Neo-Humanism defeats the constraints of narrowly technical or anthropocentric ethical frameworks.

What is of essence in the study is that Avenue is constructed upon human-centered but exhaustive paradigm to harmonize technological innovation with moral responsibility and social equity. The message of Neo-Humanism is that it does not have technical solutions to offer; rather, its significance is in determining an ethical direction for the development and governance of AI. By incorporating rational ethics with spiritual awareness, Neo-Humanism puts forth an approach that gives priority to values in technology with focus on the overall welfare of humanity and its sustainable growth. In this era when AI agents are increasingly writing the destiny of humans, Neo-Humanism by Sarkar stands as a useful philosophical resource for leading on a path of responsible, inclusive, and ethically sound technological advance.

References

1. Floridi, L. (2019). *Establishing the rules for building trustworthy AI*. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(6), 261–262.
2. Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9), 389–399.
3. Russell, S. (2019). *Human compatible: Artificial intelligence and the problem of control*. Viking.
4. Sarkar, P. R. (1982). *The liberation of intellect: Neo-humanism*. Ananda Marga Publications.
5. Sarkar, P. R. (1992). *Ānanda Sūtram*. Ananda Marga Publications.
6. UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. UNESCO Publishing.
7. Sarkar, P.R. "PROUT: The Progressive Utilization Theory." Ananda Marga Publications, 1959.
8. Sarkar, P.R. "Social Responsibility in Economic Activity." Ananda Marga Publications, 1990.

9.Sharma, Ravi.: *“Economic Transformation and PROUT: A New Paradigm for Development”*. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2020.

10.Sarkar, P.R. *“Neo-Humanism: A Philosophy of Humanitarianism and Empowerment”*. Ananda Marga Publications, 2014.

11.Sarkar, P.R. *“Neo-Humanism: A Social Philosophy for All”*. Ananda Marga Publications, 2016.

12.Sarkar, P.R. *“Education and Society: A Neo-Humanist Perspective.”* International Journal of Humanistic Studies, vol. 14, no. 1, 2015.

13.Sarkar, P.R. *“Social Philosophy: Theoretical Foundations and Practical Applications”*. Ananda Marga Publications, 2018.

14.Sarkar, P.R. *“Developments and Issues: A Study in Human Relations”*. Ananda Marga Publications, 2020.

15.Sarkar, P.R. *“Neo-Humanism: A Philosophy for Our Times”*. Ananda Marga Publications, 2015.

16.Sarkar, P.R. *“Social Philosophy: The Moral Imperative for Society”*. Ananda Marga Publications, 2011.

17.Sarkar, P.R. *“The Role of Psychology in Neo-Humanism.”* Journal of Humanistic Psychology, vol. 8, no. 2, 2017, pp. 24-38.

18.Bhattacharya, Navin. *“Neo-Humanism in Business Ethics: A New Paradigm.”* International Journal of Business Ethics, vol. 19, no. 2, 2020.

19.Sarkar, P. R. (1992). *“Neo-humanism in a Nutshell”*. Ananda Marga Publications.

