

ARTICLES
IN THIS NUMBER



AKU VISALA

Can a Robot be a Morally Responsible Agent?

The moral status of human-like robots is unclear. Should we offer moral treatment to robots? This article focuses on one form of moral treatment: the practices that make up moral responsibility. These include, for example, punishment, reprimand, blame, praise and reward. The question is whether attitudes about and the practice of moral responsibility can be justified of robots. According to responsibility pessimists, robots should never be held morally responsible, because they lack some of the capacity necessary for moral agency—for example, consciousness, autonomy, or free will. Optimists, on the other hand, think that robots could, at least in principle, be apt subjects of our responsibility attitudes. The article begins with a discussion of moral responsibility and its rationale. It then examines two arguments of responsibility pessimists, the first concerning consciousness and the second, autonomy. After making critical observations about these arguments, it outlines a cautiously optimistic position, according to which robots may not be capable of full responsibility but could nevertheless be suitable targets for at least some responsibility attitudes.

JAANA HALLAMAA & TAINA KALLIOKOSKI

Bearing Responsibility
When Sociotechnical Systems Fail

In society, those who have made a serious mistake or caused damage must bear responsibility for their actions by submitting themselves to sanctions imposed by the legal system. Traditional philosophical conditions for determining responsibility, however, become inadequate, when a technological pseudo-actor such as an artificial intelligence or socio-technical system has caused or been a party in a harmful incident. Philosophers call this phenomenon the responsibility gap, whereas in the social sciences the situation is known as the problem of many hands. This article critically applies various studies on human error and philosophical theories of social action and responsibility to formulate conceptual, practical, and moral psychological conditions for success and failure in taking social action and bearing joint responsibility in a context of sociotechnical systems. By conceptualizing responsibility as social relational action and widening it to cover even passive forms of complicity, at least some of the difficulties in accounting for responsibility can be resolved.

TIIA LIUSKI, JANNE AALTO &
TAINA KALLIOKOSKI

Emerging Military Technology:
A Challenge for Military Ethics and
Military Chaplains as Trainers?

The Finnish military chaplains' work is increasingly focused on training. The renewed conscript training programmes do well in accounting for a soldier's mind and ethics, which is why it is necessary to consider the skills of chaplains as ethical trainers. Emerging military technologies have also brought new ethical issues to the fore. In this article, we analyse how emerging military technologies challenge the soldier's ethical action competence and what professional skills the chaplaincy need to support the soldiers. In the 2020s, the military chaplaincy are working in a pluralistic society and operational environment, where the window for taking action in pre-crisis times has shrunk, the tensions in the security environment have increased and the role of soldiers has become more international. As the ethical action competence is an integral part of the soldiers' overall action competence in the Finnish Defence Forces, it must remain intact. Developing military technologies test the ethical decision-making capacities and moral identities of soldiers. The military chaplaincy can respond to these new challenges of technologies with pedagogical, theological and worldview-related expertise.

ANTON BERG & KATJA VALASKIVI

Datafied Religion: Commercial Image
Recognition Services for "Identifying" Religion

In this exploratory study, we investigate the classification of religious images by Google, Microsoft, and Amazon's image recognition services and how these systems can perpetuate human biases. Our findings reveal secularist, Christian, commercial, and racist biases within these services. While earlier studies have focused on biases related to ethnicity, gender and sexual orientation, religion remains empirically underexplored. We address the following research questions: How do these services identify religion, and what differences are there between them? How do they perform with images depicting religious gatherings or rituals? Do identification performances differ based on religious tradition, gender or ethnicity?