

PART I: IMPLICATIONS OF THE MMEGHARI ANYA (THIRD-TIER PERCEPTION OR ILLUSION) IN HUMAN-AI INTERACTION

<https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ezumezu.v3i1.1>

Submission: April 10, 2026

Accepted: June 30, 2026

Innocent I. ASOUZU

University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria

Email: frasouzu@unical.edu.ng

ORCID NO.: <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-4214-9263>

Abstract

In this essay, I contend that matters of human-AI interaction, and most especially issues relating to AI safety, are not purely external technical matters: they also have a noetic, deeply philosophical, pre-technological dimension that is internal and should always be borne in mind. This is why this essay examines the commanding role that what I call **ihe mmeghari anya** (third-tier perception or illusion) plays in human-AI interaction. To portray the special character of this phenomenon in the way we relate to machines, do science, and relate to each other generally, I adopt a realist *ibuanyidanda*, or complementary realist, approach. This concerns, for example, issues raised in some post-humanist circles within philosophy of mind and neuroscience, as well as issues specifically related to the nature of consciousness and the constraints that utility-driven logic imposes on the use of AI. Adopting this complementary realist approach, the essay analyses critical issues resulting from the impact of *ihe mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion) on the way we perceive the world, such as Immunity from Responsibility, AI Blaming, the Herostratus Syndrome, Illusions of Unlimited Wealth Creation and Unlimited Exercise of Power, and Usurpation of Personal Autonomy. I probe further the ambivalent nature of AI and its impact on the tension between technical, theoretical, and practical reason. I recommend more integration of complementary logic rather than relying solely on pre-deterministic binary calculus in matters relating to human-AI interaction.

Keywords: *Ibuanyidanda* or complementary realism, ontological boomerang effect, *Ihe mmeghari anya*, third-tier category or perception, illusion, complementary logical reasoning, AI safety.

Introduction

In *Ibuanyidanda* philosophy (Complementary Reflection), I envisage an era characterised by a radical shift in emphasis from “we against them mentality” to one of mutual complementary dependence and cooperation. It is an attempt to map out a new way of thinking and relating to the world that is grounded in the method and principles of complementarity, as outlined in my writings, especially in the work [The Method and Principles of Complementary Reflection in and beyond African Philosophy]. Complementary Reflection exposes some of the weaknesses of any ontology or logic grounded on a dualistic, exclusivist type of reasoning. This is why in the work [Ibuanyidanda: New Complementary Ontology: Beyond World-Immanentism, Ethnocentric Reduction and Impositions], I proposed “a new form of ontology that seeks to grasp being from the preceding conditions of its complementary determination devoid of exclusiveness and world-immanentism. *This is the new complementary turn*” (ASOUZU 2007, 123). One can then say that, with what I designate as “The New Complementary Turn” (ASOUZU 2007, 123), I seek to show how we can transcend all forms of divisive and exclusivist reasoning that derive their inspiration from a philosophy of essence, inspired by Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*, which polarises and divides. That is to say, any ontology or logical reasoning modelled after a philosophy of essence polarises and divides in the most radical ways, instead of harmonising and uniting (ASOUZU 2011, 39).

Artificial Intelligence (AI) can be considered as the agent that has the capacity to draw the connecting threads of all things technological towards itself as their ground of authentication. In this way, AI stays at the centre of our technological age as we see how it impacts almost all facets of our lives. In this new era marked by the dominance of Artificial Intelligence, complementary reasoning, as a viable alternative way of relating to the world and reality in general, deserves more attention in view of credibly handling some issues related to the harmony of differences. We can say the same in terms of offering a foundational logic for some of the tools on which humans can rely credibly to interact with AI and allied technologies. To such tools belong, most especially, viable machine language, machine learning, and machine training. This is all the more necessary if we remember that AI optimisation continues to evolve and accelerate at an incredible speed, often fuelled by many factors that deserve a credible method and principles on which they can rely to sort out differences. We see this most especially when market economic considerations are among the major forces driving AI development and integration. Situations of this kind have a way of intensifying cutthroat competition, and the urge to edge out competitors with any means possible in view of dominance. OpenAI's decision to grant full access to U.S. military use of AI at the expense of Anthropic, which refused such access, comes readily to mind (O'DONNELL 2026). Situations of this kind are bound to persist unless we have credible ways of addressing a divisive type of mind-set with which many handle differences in matters of human-AI integration. Not only in the domain of commerce and industry is the threat to approach the world with a divisive exclusivist type of mind-set given, but also in almost all matters of human interaction where our most cherished interests are at stake. It is almost the same pattern that is followed in resolving conflicts, even among nations the world over: It is a situation where conflict parties threaten each other with extinction contrary to the high ideals they proclaim. These are typical cases of the human subject tempted to approach the world with a divisive exclusivist type of mind-set in view of upholding advantages over those it considers as threatening its interests. One would have expected that this issue should be better contained in the way scientists go about their work. Quite unfortunately, like most human matters, scientific investigations are often conducted also with a divisive exclusivist type of mind-set: Even if Max Weber's theory of value-oriented bias in inquiry is stretched too far, as Ernest Nagel makes us understand, mind-sets very much impact the content of conclusions in any given scientific investigation (NAGEL 1981, 406-417). Where the mind-set underlying scientific investigations is utility- and profit-driven, this is bound to heavily impact the way scientists and entrepreneurs approach their subject matter and pursue their goals. This is very important in an AI age, which, in many respects, seems to be largely dominated by profit-focused strategies with the attendant divisive exclusivist type of mind-set that drives competition. If such a situation goes unchecked, it is bound to complicate matters on the role AI, as a very powerful technology, plays in our lives.

This is one of the many reasons I pursue a New Complementary Turn in how we relate to the world and to each other. It aims at creating awareness concerning the central role complementary logical reasoning plays in all undertakings; and how it can contribute in addressing issues of exclusivist and divisive types of behaviour. It is the same thing as trying to point out the invaluable asset we have if we approach the world with a complementary type of mind-set in the way we deal with each other. In most of those cases where stakeholders insist on approaching the world with a divisive, exclusivist type of mind-set, they seem to suggest that the best strategies to get what we want are those that are deeply rooted in unilateral, selfish measures. Such approaches are, in so far, unrealistic, as they can very easily trigger what I call **the ontological boomerang effect of Ibuanyidanda philosophy** (in Igbo language, egbe bere ugo bere, nke si ibe ya ebena nku kwaa ya. That is: let the kite perch, let the eagle perch; whichever denies the other the right to perch let its wings break). The ontological boomerang effect is an existential condition in which what it takes to achieve a goal is also

what is needed to negate it. This makes getting at the root causes of this phenomenon that can complicate matters in a world that in many respects is deeply divided, and where many insist on addressing reality with a divisive exclusivist type of mind-set, believing that they are wise and smart. Acting in a way that triggers the ontological boomerang effect, even unintentionally, is a clear indication of a rift in the internal workings of human consciousness that needs to be addressed. As this matter concerns AI specifically, the New Complementary Turn of Ibunya philosophy emphasises the invaluable nature of complementary logic, and recourse to a complementary type of mind-set, in all matters dealing with human-AI interaction. By making recourse to complementary logic, we can all the more enrich the resources at our disposal needed to address matters relating to AI. This is especially the case if we remember that most methods in vogue rely heavily on pre-deterministic binary formal logical calculus that draws its inspirations from Aristotelian formal logical reasoning and metaphysics. What this entails is the need to better understand the dynamic character of human consciousness and mirror it, while bearing in mind some of its limitations, in the way we relate to machines, and most especially in matters dealing with machine language, machine learning and machine training.

In the past decades, much work has been done by my students, colleagues and scholars around the world to key into the ideas driving Ibunya philosophy. These are the forces today that are driving and spreading the idea of complementarity as a credible way of doing philosophy, conducting scientific investigations, and organising ourselves in society. It is gratifying to note that Ibunya philosophy has inspired a new generation of thinkers, especially in African philosophy, who are proposing variants of Ibunya philosophy under various brands, as we have them, for example, in Harmonious Monism (Chris IJIOMAH), Integrative Humanism (Godfrey OZUMBA and Jonathan CHIMAKONAM), Consolationism (Ada AGADA), Ezumezu Logic (Jonathan CHIMAKONAM), Conversational philosophy (Jonathan CHIMAKONAM, etc.) and many others. These are offshoots of what has always united us at the Calabar School of Philosophy as we focus on carrying the message of complementarity as the philosophy of a new era. Hence, the growth and spread of complementary philosophy has been made possible as a teamwork of determined scholars who are committed to this idea. Among other motives driving our engagements, especially at the Calabar School of Philosophy, is the desire to give African philosophy a stronger voice on the world philosophical stage and in broader academic circles. For this reason, I recognise with gratitude the efforts of all who are engaged in promoting the idea of complementarity as a reliable paradigm in a world threatened by exclusivist and divisive tendencies; even in the way scientific investigations are conducted. One can say that recourse to the idea of complementarity today, in view of resolving conflict, is a big step forward in the right direction; and one that demands a complete paradigm shift, especially in the way we do science. I recognise, in a special way, the invaluable contributions of Prof. Jonathan O. Chimakonam, who has invested much energy in creating awareness about this movement. It is through his determination that African logic grounded on the idea of complementarity has been taken up into the University Curriculum as a course; and for the first time ever, at the Institute for Logic, Language and Computation (ILLC), University of Amsterdam. It was Prof. Heinz Kimmerle, one of the pioneers and the leading voices in Intercultural Philosophy, who referred to the idea of complementarity as “the specific contribution of African philosophy to world philosophy” (KIMMERLE 2014, 221-223).

The Methodological Questions and Ibunya Philosophy

At no time has the need for a paradigm shift in the way we relate to the world been as pressing as in our AI-driven digital age, with the imposing nature of AI taking centre stage. If classical metaphysics concentrates more on issues relating to unchangeable absolute essences, we see

the same matter resurfacing today in a completely new form. Here, we have to deal with AI assuming the character of an eternal absolute essence that determines and legislates all. Where AI evokes this type of all-legitimising and all-determining outlook, one of the first issues that comes to mind is its impact on human personal autonomy. This issue is bound to be constitutive of the way we do science and organise ourselves in society as relatively autonomous individuals in an AI age. To address issues of this kind, in my earlier writings I made recourse to what I call a transcendent, complementary, comprehensive existential analysis geared towards understanding why the human subject often seeks its autonomy outside the foundation of its unity in being that is complementarily constituted. I will adopt the same strategy in this essay. However, this time I will try to understand why the human subject often strives to seek its autonomy in AI and not in being that is complementarily constituted.

By way of summary: in my earlier analysis, as contained in my writings, and most especially as articulated in my work [Ibuanyidanda (complementary Reflection) and Some Basic Philosophical Problems in Africa Today: Sense Experience], I came to the conclusion that the human subject always strives to seek its autonomy outside the foundation of its unity in being because of certain existential constraints that blindfold the ego into making false assumptions concerning how to go about its needs, and how this can very easily lead to fatal errors of judgment. Such constraints include the fact that all existential situations are ambivalent, tension-laden and are beclouded by the *mkpuchi anya* (the phenomenon of concealment). It is on account of this existential constraint that the human subject easily gets the wrong impression that it is the centre of the world, and as such all matters have to be resolved to satisfy its egoistic desires. By following this impulse, the human subject easily becomes entangled in an extreme form of selfishness that terminates in the negation of the interests of other stakeholders within any given framework. When this happens, the human subject very easily fails to realise that within *any given framework of complementing units, what any of the units constituting the whole undertakes to subvert the interest of any of the other units always boomerangs*. In other words, subverting such interests does not pay since selfishness makes the realisation of the interests of even the offending unit difficult, if not impossible, because of the inherent moment of necessity that underlies their mode of complementary relationship. This implies that all acts of excessive selfishness are counterproductive, as they automatically trigger an ontological boomerang effect that negatively impacts all stakeholders. This is why I say that acts of consistent self-interest are anti-self-interest. Conversely, positive acts rebound positively.

Arriving at this conclusion is one of the cardinal fruits of a transcendent, complementary, and comprehensive existential analysis. What is instructive is that this situation is not always evident to actors when they blindly pursue their egoistic interests because of the existential constraints to which they are exposed. Hence, it is on account of this existential constraint that, in most decisive situations of life, where our most cherished interests are challenged, we instinctively tend to act always in a one-dimensional, absolutely irrational way; and so much so that we tend to do those things we despise and criticise while refraining from doing those things we extol, cherish and praise to the high heavens. This is why in such cases, lawgivers can very easily become lawbreakers without realising it. By focusing only on the self as the only legitimising centre of our personal autonomy, we easily forget that such an autonomy is defective and overhaul worth. How to correct the error of judgement that leads to the ontological boomerang effect is a methodological task of Ibuanyidanda philosophy as a philosophy of complementary reflection.

Generally, I seek to resolve matters of this kind by recourse to **complementary Ibuanyidanda logic enshrined in complementary logical reasoning**. The aim is to make it insightful to stakeholders that whenever complementarity is negated, the ontological boomerang effect of ibuanyidanda is bound to be

triggered. For this reason, there is a need to consider all existent realities as missing links for any act to be considered rational, authentic and worth pursuing. This can be achieved when stakeholders can insightfully affirm: “anything that exists serves a missing link of reality for the joy of being.” In this affirmation subsists what I call the ontological/metaphysical principle of Ibuanidanda philosophy or “the Principle of Integration” which reveals to stakeholders that consistent self-interest is anti-self-interest; something that always boomerangs and must be avoided. (ASOUZU 2004, 273; 2005, 281)

The present essay seeks to inculcate this lesson all the more. It does this with particular attention to the type of mind-set with which we address issues generally; and, most especially, as this involves what can be done to enhance the quality of machine language, machine learning, and machine training; in view of making AI safer and more beneficial. Addressing issues relating to AI in this mode derives from the fact that where the mind-set used to address issues in this direction is bifurcating and exclusivist, this is bound to resonate in the way machines are trained and deployed.

Ibuanidanda or Complementary Realism and Special Challenges of the *mmeghari anya* (Third Tier Perception or illusion)

To start with, I have always maintained that all human existential situations remain constrained because they are under the influence of our ambivalent, tension-laden experiences that are beclouded by the *mkpuchi anya* (phenomenon of concealment). With the way AI operates, it has all it takes to complicate this tension-laden ambivalent situation all the more. When one considers the speed and accuracy with which AI accomplishes most tasks, it appears to be the summit of Aristotle’s rational human person whose essence is rationality. On account of its character, AI exudes a near-magical aura that can condition human perception of the world, in some special ways, in all matters dealing with human-AI interaction. In AI, one notices a type of connecting thread that draws almost everything technological towards itself as their summit, their centre of gravity and their tying knot. As dependent, insufficient human subjects, this otherworldly aura AI creates can naturally lead individuals to seek their autonomy in what AI has to offer. We are dealing here directly with a typical case where the AI agent can very easily be mistaken as constituting the foundation of human personal autonomy instead of **being** that which is complementarily constituted. This mystical aura is one of the most radical challenges AI can simulate: I call it **the *mmeghari anya*** (third-tier category or third-tier perception insofar as it has the capacity to create an illusion about the nature of the world. The expression “the *mmeghari anya*” is taken from the Igbo language of Nigeria and translates literally into English as something that confuses or generates confusion, or something that generates illusion. Its nearest English equivalent can be rendered as third-tier category, third-tier perception or illusion. In other words, AI has the capacity to simulate a third category between the real and ideal divide. What this means is that the human existential situation that is already tension-laden and beclouded by the *mkpuchi anya* (phenomenon of concealment), is now complicated further by the very powerful impositions arising from the *mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion); something drawing its force from the imposing character of AI in all modes of human-AI interaction. As a simulated third tier category, it can challenge further the ontological boundaries of truth between the real and ideal divide, between being and its attributes. As of today, the *mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion) can be said to be epitomised by what we call **Deepfake**, which demonstrates how this challenge to the boundaries of truth can further be extended, radicalised and complicated. Naturally, as developments in AI advance, the character of such illusion is bound to follow suit. Since the phenomenon of the *mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion) derives its dynamic character from the perplexing nature of AI, one can say that it is mediated by AI itself. One of

the most grievous consequences of this mediated impact subsists in the capacity of AI to amplify the nature of reality as discrete quantities without any form of complementary relationship whatsoever. In this way, the impression is created that seeking solutions is something best done only by relying on one-dimensional technical, world-immanent materialistic means deriving from technology and AI inspired processes. That is to say, *ihē mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion) contributes much in amplifying the impression that machine- and technology-based solutions are the most viable options among alternatives.

Addressing issues deriving from this type of challenge entails making recourse to an approach that is adequate enough to confront the matters raised. This is why adopting an *ibuanidanda* or complementary type of realism is mandatory in view of addressing some of the special issues associated with *ihē mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion) in human-AI interaction. Adopting this realist approach is, in so far, very important, as it can contribute to better understanding of some special disciplinary issues, most especially in the areas of philosophy of mind, neuroscience, and matters relating to consciousness. The same can be said concerning some important issues being discussed today in some post-humanist circles. What may not always be obvious in these areas is the subtle dominant dualistic tendencies in the way many critical issues are handled and discussed. They are types of dualistic realism that consider existent realities as discrete quantities, and such that can exist independent of each other without any form of relationship whatsoever. In this way, they can be seen as remnants of Aristotle's dualistic realism in matters of logic and metaphysics. They are the types of dualistic approaches that reveal a mind-set that is exclusivist and polarising in the way the human subject attends to very important issues. In most contentious situations involving the use of AI to resolve issues, *ihē mmeghari anya* (third tier perception or illusion) has a way of constraining the human subject to resolve matters in a dualistic unilateral mode.

To address such matters adequately, I pursue a type of realism that, in its dynamism, seeks to grasp reality from the foregoing condition of its complementary interrelatedness; one that, in its future determination, is interminable and enduring. It is a type of realism that seeks to do away with all kinds of divisiveness and exclusivist tendencies. What marks an *ibuanidanda* or complementary type of realism out is its capacity to affirm all existent realities as *ihē di nwere isi na ọdu* or missing links that are in mutual complementary relationship for the joy of being (ASOUZU 2007, 10). With this, *ibuanidanda* realism points to the ever evolving and revealing nature of all missing links as they seek to serve each other interminably in mutual complementary relationship. What this shows is that the nature of any given thing or missing link, at any given moment, is not all that can be had or said of the thing in question. It is rather something whose actual mode of determination is future-related. It is in consideration of this future-relatedness that its value and mode of being are bound to become clearer, as we probe into this future that gives all modes of determination their dynamism. This is when we say in Igbo language *nke iru ka* i.e., greatest events are in the future. We can then say that those enterprises *nwere isi na ọdu* i.e., *they serve a missing link, and as such should be prioritised*. Proceeding in this way to determine what should be constitutive, both conceptually and ethically, in our dealings with AI and allied technologies is very important if we consider the high hopes AI raises, and such that makes many believe that with the opportunities it provides most human problems can be addressed with the accuracy of computation. Naturally, AI does not always disappoint. It does indeed fulfil some of these hopes placed on it. Hence, even those scientific efforts that approach the world with a dualistic divisive type of mind-set do not labour in vain completely. A realist *ibuanidanda*, or complementary type of realism, recognises this fact. It is very important to point out this fact because more often than not, approaches that are dualistic in outlook can still yield fruits that can be useful elsewhere. Even if the primary goal does not yield the implicitly intended results, the secondary unintended benefits can still be

considered as serving missing links. That is to say, most issues often have unintended consequences that can be beneficial.

Hence, the question will always remain: how can we penetrate the world-immanent mechanistic, materialistic, and technological form of determination that AI creates and imposes on our perception of reality, and still reap some of the major benefits of AI? As difficult as it may be, in some given instances, to say with certainty what the case is, all forms of commitment remain useful in the measure they serve a missing link of reality. In other words, in serving a missing link, they demonstrate that they are realistic, reasonable, meaningful and responsible. This notwithstanding, they merely serve as stepping stones towards giving complete answers to questions posed; if we remember that reality is constituted in a future-related mode (ihe ukwu ikpe azu i.e., the future harbours far more than we can imagine). An approach that seeks to give answers to issues raised is in this measure realistic, reasonable, and responsible as they aim at a complementary comprehensive type of answer. This is why one can say that those attempts that seek to provide insight into the nature of consciousness by way of neuroscience are realistic, reasonable, and responsible insofar as they serve certain priorities, for example in medicine, in psychiatry and other areas of human needs. Definitely, the advance of science in their respective areas in a future-related mode is bound to reveal that some of the factors that are now considered as the foundations of building such theories are not even the decisive factors, since neurons, for example, can be accounted for based on what we know concerning an innumerable number of relations. In this connection, even the most insignificant and often neglected missing links can still be identified as some of the most revealing in the whole process of understanding. In situations of this kind, all forms of materialistic, mechanistic, and technology-driven types of realism remain realistic, reasonable, and responsible responses towards questions posed; they do so, however, in the measure they are seen as serving a missing link of reality. Relying on an ibuanya variant of realism, therefore, I am committed to a causal type of understanding devoid of a positivist and purely technology-driven type of explaining the way ihe mmeghari anya (third-tier perception or illusion) impacts our perception of events. Not only can ihe mmeghari anya (third-tier perception or illusion) conceal the true nature of the world from us in the way we do science, but in almost all areas of life. For this reason, I wish to shed more light on the way it can complicate our relationship with reality by way of an existential analysis drawn from real world situations. The three topics I have chosen for existential analysis include:

- A. Immunity from Responsibility, AI Blaming, the Herostratus Syndrome and Reason turning against itself
- B. Illusions of Unlimited Wealth Creation and Unlimited Exercise of Power
- C. Usurpation of Personal Autonomy by AI

Existential Analysis A: Immunity from Responsibility, AI Blaming, the Herostratus Syndrome, and Reason turning against itself

When considering AI as an ambivalent technology, ihe mmeghari anya (third-tier perception or illusion) has all it takes to condition human-AI interaction in quite unexpected ways. In other words, this phenomenon has the capacity to influence and manipulate the type of ideas humans have about AI and the world in very significant ways. One of the greatest impacts it can have on human perception of AI is that of projecting AI as an omnipotent presence or a surrogate deity with limitless potentialities. This can very easily account for the tendency for humans to mischaracterise AI, and to the extent that some impute to it attributes it does not possess. We can then understand how the fascination evoked by AI, due to its apparent capacity to do things fast and with near accuracy, has led to the point where many seem to believe that AI can do almost anything. For this reason, it is almost an ultimate self-constituting agent, and one that

has the power to legislate absolutely. From here follow some of those doomsday fantasies associated with AI running out of control. Misunderstanding, and at times, illusions of this kind can easily give rise to the tendency of imputing, not only absolute powers to AI, but even shifting responsibility to it in the belief that it can always do it better. The moment the feeling that AI is omnipotent is consummated, the next step is for actors to hide behind AI to pursue all sorts of goals; even very questionable ones, and thereby tacitly create the impression that AI is to be held accountable. In other words, AI is to blame for human failures. For this reason, the human subject in dealings with AI can very easily feel exonerated for questionable actions it takes, while hiding behind an AI that is projected as having limitless potentialities.

The decisive question is: if human subjects can very easily take credit for the positive benefits of AI, would they also very readily take full responsibility for some of its worst failures? Granted, most governments strive always to uphold legislative oversight in matters of technological development; the mere fact that people can hide behind a technology they often seem not to understand fully will remain a problem in all matters dealing with AI. AI as an ambivalent technology can easily raise fantasies to unmanageable proportions and something that can motivate unscrupulous individuals and developers of technology into exploring its potentials to unthinkable limits. This is an area where the *mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion) can very easily take the upper hand, as it pushes researchers and developers to explore AI capabilities beyond all imaginable limits. In the same way, it constrains many to think that AI can do all things. This is what I designate as **the “AI can do it all mentality”**. Such a mentality can raise unrealistic expectations: it enhances and can reinforce the reciprocal relationship between the developers of AI products and what the public expects of them. It is such a reciprocal relationship whereby fulfilled expectations are met with the motivation to refine further AI potentials. Where this type of reciprocal relationship continues unchecked, it has the capacity to put all in a tight corner. Worst is when such a spiral leads to AI addiction on the part of consumers who always expect more, and an addiction on the part of developers who always strive to steer AI towards unknown frontiers. This challenge is still the worst in an AI environment, highly charged and determined by market forces, ambition, a thirst for fame, and the pressure to excel and edge out competitors by all kinds of thinkable and unthinkable means and strategies. This fact is sustained by the fascination that derives from the ever evolving improvements in the AI industry, which is enhanced by the belief that AI is the future. For this reason, there is the urge to invest heavily in AI with the firm belief that it has the capacity to address almost all forms of life’s challenges. Worst still is when people operate under the illusion that since AI is so capable, then it must be held accountable for all its actions, not excluding human negligence and failures. The moment the human subject has been conditioned to reason in this way, the temptation to steer AI development beyond all imaginable limits is always given, not minding the risks. This is when optimisation can very easily become an obsession, and can easily lead to the point where what it takes to steer AI goes beyond what human natural intuition can cope with. Where this happens, there is always the danger of humans losing control of their own creation because they can no longer cope with the demands of the speed and accuracy with which AI accomplishes tasks.

Quite interestingly, we often live with such precarious situations under the illusion that all is normal. Since no one would readily like to take responsibility due to the complex character of AI’s operations, the tendency is to shift the blame to AI, whose modes of operation remain so intricate that it is almost incomprehensible in its powers. This tendency to shift responsibility to AI, even at the risk of AI running out of control, remains a big threat in the way AI development is proceeding on most fronts. The impression is created that if anything goes wrong, then almighty AI is to blame due to its complex and near incomprehensible character. In cases where AI development is driven by profit, fame, and other forms of inordinate ambition that go beyond caution, this attitude can have very severe consequences. It

is an attitude of this kind that I characterise as the **Herostratus Syndrome at work in the age of AI**. It is the urge to cause mischief with the hidden intention of deriving some profit or some advantages. Herostratus burned the temple of Artemis completely in 356 BCE seeking fame. He burned the temple of Artemis through destruction; his was an act of infamy. He wanted to attain immortality through notoriety. He was condemned to death and executed by Ephesian authorities for this singular infamous act. Furthermore, a *damnatio memoriae* was imposed on his person, i.e., the purposeful erasure of a person from public memory. Quite unfortunately, historians outside Ephesus recorded the story, and Herostratus achieved what he intended, namely, to be immortalised.

Going by what is happening in our approach with AI development being pushed to its limits, we have before us a similar case to what happened at Ephesus. We are in an era where the global temple is under severe threat of being burnt down, but many are more interested in what they can gain from AI development, not minding how our egoistic cravings can impact the optimisation of AI beyond thinkable limits. The difference from the Herostratus incident is that he openly declared his intention to burn down the temple of Artemis. AI provides the anonymity to many who seek to burn the global temple down while being driven by an insatiable appetite for AI products, an insatiable pursuit of curiosity, profit, fortune and fame. In our dealings with AI, the intention to burn down the temple remains, but the powerful force of the *mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion) generated around AI provides the anonymity behind which we can hide or suppress our intentions. In other words, we transfer our intentions to AI and consider it as the very agent that strives relentlessly to burn down the global temple. What this shows is that the many threats many often think AI poses are real. However, when carefully considered, it is not AI itself that is the problem; those hiding behind the anonymity it provides are some of the greatest threats to the world today. Here, we are all involved in one way or the other, as creators or consumers of AI products: our expectations and consumption patterns reinforce AI research and development. In most matters dealing with AI safety, we are dealing with dangers posed by humans to their fellow human beings. In our haste and ambition to create the most powerful machines, ambition is easily mistaken for Super AI that has infinite powers. The mere fact that the focus is now on Super AI creates the illusion that humans are not all that dangerous but AI. This is why one of the greatest challenges of reason in human-AI interaction is the illusion that humans have become very intelligent because they can create AI; and we thereby forget or try to suppress human frailty. Within such a climate, there is always the danger of turning reason against itself, believing that we are wise and smart. The *mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion) can make this happen easily. In most matters dealing with AI, the tendency is to hide behind the anonymity provided by a powerful machine to project a mind-set that is overhaul worthy. Suppressing the truth about personal responsibility, human frailty, and hyping human intelligence constitute some of the greatest challenges in the age of AI. The tendency is to shift attention to AI as if it is a self-conscious, responsible agent, whereas behind the veil is the ego that takes hold of every opportunity to refine its passion for self-destruction under the veil of self-actualisation, without taking responsibility. The worst form of this development is losing touch with what it means to be human, where stakeholders are completely lost in the sterile perfectionist, and fast world of AI. Where this happens, AI can create a condition where humans become numb to the feelings of their own fellow human beings, and to the actual needs of the world since they see the world only through the optics of machines.

In striving consistently to refine and push technology beyond all imaginable boundaries, we are confronted with a typical instance of human consciousness being at war with itself and with the totality of reality. It is a typical instance of the ego trying to absolutise relative world-immanent existents, believing that this is the wisest and smartest thing to do. It suggests an inherent urge in the ego to take measures that can be contrary to its interests without

fully being aware of this fact. At such moments we suffer illusions about the real nature of the world; we imagine that world-immanence, relativity, are mere irritants that stand in the way of absolutising our potentialities. We are then not surprised at the capacity of such a situation to evoke crisis within the subject itself and in its relationship to the totality of reality. Unless there is some sort of control mechanism that is adequate to regulate human relationship with AI, the anonymity it creates is bound to be misused to the detriment of all. In the age of AI, being awake to our personal responsibility in view of firmly integrating into our views control mechanisms that make misuse of AI difficult is a methodological task.

Existential Analysis B: Illusions of Unlimited Wealth Creation and Unlimited Exercise of Power

As an ambivalent technology, AI has demonstrated beyond all reasonable doubt that it is a veritable instrument of transformation in improving the overall human condition and well-being. Hardly any technology has the capabilities of AI to transform human experience in terms of human needs, individually, collectively or institution wise. Within the short period of its ascendancy as a preferred tool of transformation, its impact is felt across all boundaries. All these positive impacts notwithstanding, AI can twist human consciousness to the point that it induces individuals to act against their own interests, without their fully realising it. This is mostly the case with many born into the modern world of AI and allied technologies. The only world they grew up knowing is one of smartphones and other AI-driven gadgets. As convenient, indispensable, and useful as these tools can be as the most preferred means of communication, they can equally have a tremendous impact on the way reality presents itself to human consciousness. Due to an oversupply of information, impressionable minds can very easily be overwhelmed by unfiltered content that competes for attention as an actual depiction of reality. In this process, what is real is mixed up with what is ideal and fictional and is complicated even more by some of the inducements deriving from the impact of the *mmeghari anya* (third-tier perceptions or illusion). The result is that reality can be projected into human consciousness as an undifferentiated piece of chaos. This is why dependence on AI to address most existential challenges has the capacity to create forms of identity crisis, loss of creativity, attention deficit, social isolation and diverse forms of AI induced marginalisation. We are then not surprised when some countries that once embraced AI-driven technologies with enthusiasm, and as the most preferred method of education and childrearing, are now retracing their steps in search of better alternatives.

Especially in the area of wealth creation, the type of illusion that AI can create can be overwhelming. There is now a new generation that tends to believe AI has a magical way to create unlimited wealth. Many, especially those who grew up with technology as the veritable tool for navigating life's challenges meaningfully, now believe that to make it in life, one must embrace AI and allied technologies in any way possible. They may not be completely wrong because AI has created, and keeps creating, wealth at an astonishingly fast pace and in incredible proportions. According to the PwC Global Artificial Intelligence Study, AI could contribute up to \$15.7 trillion to the global economy by 2030. . Going by such statistics, AI driven economies have a way of churning our wealth beyond comprehension. This trend is easily collaborated by the rising number of ultra-rich whose wealth has much to do with AI and allied technologies. Elon Musk, the richest man on earth to date, epitomises this revolution. It is then quite understandable why many keep counting the days when Musk will become the first AI and technology-driven trillionaire. This is the belief driving confidence in alternative investment strategies, e.g., those involving cryptocurrency, regardless of the risks. Most traditional ways of wealth creation are undergoing severe scrutiny and rapid changes, such that many born into the era of new technologies hardly believe any longer in the traditional ways of wealth creation. With many fintech companies entering the scene, there appear to be tremendous changes in the way the banking and financial sector seeks to achieve maximum

results and impact average consumers. These are financial technologies that leverage software, mobile apps and AI to provide faster, more accessible, and cheaper alternatives to traditional banking services. Leveraging the opportunities AI and allied technologies provide, some use AI to exploit a natural gullibility rooted in our hunger for wonder. This is how some of them program their services in ways that update interest rates in real time, thereby creating the impression that with technology it is indeed possible to generate wealth with ease. This strategy is very important as it can appeal to the human sense of greed that seeks to exploit every opportunity to maximise profit. Seeing their investments steadily increase in real time, many, especially the less informed, have come to believe in the power of AI and allied technologies to actually generate wealth. When carefully considered, in such deceptive strategies, what has actually changed is the speed and accuracy with which AI updates their investments. We are then not surprised at the explosive rate some of these AI-driven financial services are expanding amongst us; and most especially among some of the lower rung consumers like street traders, market people, people at the grassroots and rural communities.

The illusion that AI and allied technologies have a magical way of creating wealth can further be seen at the rate people of all ages and persuasions are rushing to become influencers and content creators: often driven by the urge to attain financial independence, leveraging any means possible, and sustained by a get-rich-quick mentality. Through the deployment of AI and allied technologies, the line of demarcation between investment and gambling has been so much narrowed and even blurred out completely. This is how El Salvador became the first government in the world to invest national assets in cryptocurrency/ Bitcoin and adopt it as legal tender in 2021, with all the uncertainties this entails. All this can happen because the *mmeghari* anya (third-tier perception or illusion) can make AI and allied technologies appear as indispensable assets that drive development in the new age, and most especially as this relates to matters of strategic national importance. This is why corrupt government officials and business people can very easily exploit the feeling of indispensability AI creates as a conduit pipe to mismanage public funds and amass wealth. Here in Nigeria, for example, over \$460 million was invested in the Abuja CCTV project to address urgent security concerns. This was intended to enhance surveillance with over 2,000 cameras and secure communications. The project succeeded in achieving the opposite since the project remained dysfunctional, Abuja continues experiencing rising insecurity, including kidnappings and other violent crimes (EBOESOMI 2025). In matters of this kind, the *mmeghari* anya (third-tier perception or illusion) can blindfold human subjects from seeking nuanced problem-solving mechanisms and alternatives. The high hopes raised by AI and the attendant illusion it can create stretch even to the traditional work ethic, where many prefer nomadic and isolated remote work patterns to the traditional sedentary office lifestyle. Many now believe in the ability of AI to create incredible conditions hitherto unknown; and one that has the capacity to usher in a new era of a life of comfort without commensurate toil. If meaning has often been sought in self-actualisation, AI has a way of twisting human consciousness to equate meaning with self-maximisation in all fields of endeavour. The impact the *mmeghari* anya (third-tier perception or illusion) has had and will continue to have on organised religion is not to be overlooked. This is most especially with regard to those born into the digital age, and most especially Generation Z. Definitely, the mind-set with which this generation approaches supernatural and ultimate realities is bound to be different; insofar as AI and allied technologies have the capacity to mystify, to expose and to conceal.

The *mmeghari* anya (third-tier perception or illusion) has what it takes to impact the sense of the sacred, choice of religious denominational commitment, and all that determines human life ultimately. Since such changes have a tremendous impact on the way we process values, this is bound to resonate in human relationships with traditional institutions like religion, whose goals, in many respects, are being vigorously challenged, highly transformed,

and commercialised. One can then understand the present conflict of interest and the crisis that is presently engulfing many densely populated Igbo Christian States of Nigeria. This relates to the conflict between Christianity and Traditional Religious values, as it has to deal with the highly charged Christianity vs Omenana/Omenani controversy (vigorous attempts to disentangle Tradition from Christianity and return to traditional ways of doing things; not minding the enormous contributions of Christianity in the overall human and material development in these Christian States). Though the motives for these yearnings may be mixed, the role financial gains and other utility-based considerations play in such complex matters cannot be ignored. This is most especially the case with the youth who seek alternative ways of making ends meet in an economically stressed environment: many of this new generation born into the era of AI and allied technologies often tend to see religion and religious matters with totally different optics and most especially from the perspective of affluence and wealth creation. Constrained by *ihe mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion) and our tension-laden ambivalent existential conditions, many now find it difficult to make clear distinctions between Christianity and Traditional Religion: what matters most is the capacity of any of these institutions to generate wealth and further means of affluence. The erosion of values and weakening of moral authority can have a lasting impact on the dynamics of society. This can impact the resurgence of crimes of all types: cyber extortion, spoofing and phishing, variants of cybercrime, ritual-killing for money, human trafficking, kidnapping for ransom, 419, Oke-ite, yahoo yahoo, yahoo plus. Hence, where *ihe mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion) remains active, this has a way of intensifying incidents of AI and affluence-induced forms of crime and criminality. We see almost the same pattern in matters of migration, both legal and illegal, where many, drawn by the distorted image of affluence they see on mass media, are ready to risk all to have their share of imagined global affluence powered by AI. This trend is epitomised in Nigeria by the so-called *japa* mentality. The word “*japa*” is taken from the Yoruba language of Nigeria and has become popular in Nigeria to designate the tendency, mostly of young people and professionals, to **flee**, or escape what, they perceive as unbearable hardship in their country. In such cases, *ihe mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion) can magnify momentary hardship as if it is an integral part of the dynamics of developing economies, as against the alleged easy life made possible by flourishing AI and technology-driven advanced economies. For this reason, they are ready to risk all to emigrate abroad in search of better opportunities, imagining that their country will never, ever, get better, even with their own little inputs. Through *japa*, Nigeria has lost a sizable number of her most valued workforce of specialists and professionals. This is why such trends can become a silent killer of any nation that does not invest much to improve and adequately remunerate its manpower to forestall mass exodus of its best and gifted minds. Since, in such situations, labour flows from the poor to more affluent countries, such a condition can contribute massively to widening the power and economic asymmetry between the affluent and poor countries. While these tendencies to escape hardship might offer minor, short-term financial gains, they have severe long-term consequences, eroding national culture and personal identity. Even worse, they destroy the very fabric of cultural life, leaving future generations lost in foreign lands and breaking the continuation of family lineages at home. Since *ihe mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion) has a way of twisting our perception of reality, it can normalise such precarious situations and make them appear harmless.

Worst still is that AI can boost the urge to misuse power by those who have access to it at the cost of others: this is the type of urge that propels the spiral of unending competition in AI industry and one that easily leads to cutthroat struggle against competitors that are earmarked to be crushed in a race for dominance no one knows where it is leading to and whose end appears grim. This is a trend that exposes a form of widespread poverty of the spirit that has to do with tendencies to absolutise AI and its benefits. Central to this poverty of spirit is

that urge to put our interests first at the cost of those we consider alien and outsiders. We can then understand the race to optimise AI, even to the point where human natural intuition for processing data can no longer keep pace with the speed at which AI processes it. The consequences of such excesses are better imagined when AI spins out of control and turns against its human creators.

Besides, in the areas of commerce, industry, and AI development, AI has a way of boosting the confidence of those who have the advantage of it, especially in terms of military and economic power. This is why it can easily evoke the feeling of invulnerability most especially in asymmetrical situations of power imbalance. In this way, the *mmeghari anya* creates (third-tier perception or illusion) the illusion that power bestows authenticity. It is for this reason that those who have the advantage of power and the means to explore the benefits AI bestows tend to use this power in almost unlimited ways, thus reflecting the very image that, with AI, nothing is impossible. Thus, to our utter dismay, even Nigerian insurgent groups, most notably the Islamic State West African Province (ISWAP) and Boko Haram, have added to their arsenal drones for more effective execution of their war against those they imagine threaten their interests (OLUMBA 2026). In this way, they are shifting their activities further into high-tech and AI-inspired. Furthermore, we are witnesses to the heightening tension that continues to engulf the world because many believe that power can be deployed indiscriminately, to the point that those who are perceived as accidental, dispensable, and inconsequential are actually treated as such, and in some cases threatened with extinction. One can then understand the rising rate of expansionist tendencies, vile forms of militarism and new forms of colonialism. These are the types of things that fuel those forms of extremist tendencies that strive to put the interests of stakeholders first, at every given opportunity, and at the exclusion of the interests of those who are perceived as outsiders, as weak and dispensable. Many of these movements have their roots in the enormous benefits bestowed by AI-driven technologies that seem to generate unending capital and other benefits that enhance the prestige and influence of stakeholders. A situation of this kind naturally boosts the existential constraints to which human consciousness is subjected at all times; and so much so that the ego tends to perceive reality in quite unrealistic ways. Among the most radical ways such constraints twist human consciousness is that they make actors susceptible to illogical conclusions and some of the worst forms of exclusivist reasoning. This is one of the root causes of what I have called the **fallacy of “the nearer the better and the safer” or the supermaxim of Ibuanidanda philosophy** (ASOUZU 2013, 24-29). In this supermaxim of Ibuanidanda philosophy, the mind follows the dictates of our natural instinct of self-preservation such that human subjects assume instinctively that those nearest to them, and those who share some bond of intimacy with them, are better and safer. That is to say, nearness bestows authenticity. In other words, they are safer and better because they are nearer. This is exactly one of the worst forms of illusion that has heavily impacted the way leadership and functional society are perceived in many African countries, especially in Nigeria. Thus, in Nigeria, democratic principles follow the dictates of this supermaxim of Ibuanidanda philosophy, where democracy is seen as the capacity to serve the interests of those with whom one shares some bond of ethnic, religious and economic intimacy. This is an error of judgement that can be further complicated in human-AI interaction due to the impact of the *mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion). It is an error of judgement that needs to be corrected, such that acting in accordance with the supermaxim of Ibuanidanda philosophy must always be avoided.

In a highly charged and polarised world driven by sectional interests, where mutual complementary co-existence appears to be abstract philosophical doctrines without foundation in reality. One can say that, in the face of these challenges, a philosophy of complementarity is not merely a way of filling a gap. On the contrary, it seeks to restore human consciousness to

its natural state of harmony to address some of these intricate issues. This matter deserves urgent attention because, notwithstanding the sophistication that characterises our technological age, there is every indication that the mind-set with which we address reality needs a thorough overhaul. This is why I consider the application of the method and principles of *ibuanidanda* inevitably for addressing such matters that relate to the way the mind processes data and reality generally. The same is valid for the way we relate to each other generally. Since AI has ways of twisting human consciousness, and does so in ways that radically impact our sense of reality, there is a need for a thoroughgoing noetic propaedeutic in the way we use AI. This is achievable if there is a way to make it insightful that authentic existence subsists in the capacity to affirm existent realities as missing links that are always in mutual complementary relationship.

Existential Analysis C: Usurpation of Personal Autonomy by AI

With the feeling that there is almost nothing AI cannot do comes the issue of a threat to human personal autonomy. Granted, opinions about the role AI plays in our lives may still be divided; hardly anyone any longer doubts its radical transformative capabilities. This is most especially with regard to those who grew up in our AI and technologically driven world. The adoption rate of AI and allied technologies is quite unprecedented, and there is every indication that this will continue to increase in the future. With this immense rate of adoption and the confidence reposed in it as a very credible means of getting tasks done more accurately and with speed, comes the feeling of indispensability of AI. Worst still is when such feelings are not limited to the use of AI to accomplish more basic tasks, but when there is every indication that AI is being deployed heavily in more critical matters of decision-making, as recent cases in warfare stand to testify. The same can be said about reliance on ubiquitous generative AI tools like ChatGPT, Gemini, and Grok to seek help, even in most intimate and personal matters. Where this happens, it also has a way of leading to dependency addiction, and one that contributes to deepening the illusion that AI is omnipotent. The moment such a dependency relationship is created, there is mutual reinforcement between what is expected of AI and what AI actually turns out to achieve. The higher the expectations become, and the more AI actually succeeds in fulfilling such expectations, the deeper the sense of dependence becomes. Moving in progression, this type of mutual reinforcement easily gets to the point where the human subject assumes that AI is actually the measure by which progress, validity, and authenticity are determined. It is for this reason that the AI revolution can be seen as more than our own industrial revolution in the classical sense of the word. For many, it has the capacity to redefine and impact in a more radical and unimaginable way the way we think, judge and perceive values and norms, and reality generally. This is why it has the capacity to redefine anew roles which individuals, institutions and organisations play in very significant ways. We are not surprised, then, that hardly a day passes without new predictions emerging about how AI will impact and transform skills, professions, and human institutions. For many, AI has the capacity to render many skills redundant and even wipe out existing professions, redefine roles and goals, and institutions; just as it has the capacity to create completely new needs and ways of addressing issues. “Computer scientist and Nobel laureate Geoffrey Hinton predicted artificial intelligence will spark a surge in unemployment and profits as companies replace workers with AI” (MA 2026).

Some titans of industry, science, and technology, e.g., Bill Gates, Elon Musk, and the Nobel physicist Christopher Pissarides, have often voiced their concerns about some of these important matters on different occasions. They are united in projecting a future in which AI has the capacity to radically challenge and transform most skills and professions. Thus:

Speaking on the “People By WTF” podcast with entrepreneur Nikhil Kamath in November, the Tesla Inc. (NASDAQ:TSLA) CEO said college can be useful

for developing social skills and spending time with people your age. But he thinks going to college to learn new skills makes less sense given the direction society has taken. “Will these skills be necessary in the future? Probably not, because we’re gonna be in like a post-work society,” Musk said. “But I think, if something’s of interest, it’s fine to go and study that. You know, to study the sciences, the arts and sciences.” (SALEEM 2026, N.P.)

In other words, they are of the view that AI and automation have the capacity to render certain roles and skills obsolete, and such that have always played important roles in our lives. For Pissarides, however, the change is bound to be one of structural transformation where “the introduction of AI and robotics will primarily lead to “structural change” rather than simply replacing workers. In other words:

Workers need to move from the sectors that destroy jobs to the sectors that create jobs.” He cited the structural transformation of the labour force in China in 1980 as an example, noting that the agricultural workforce drastically declined over just 20 years, shifting to the manufacturing sector, where the labour proportion was initially close to zero. (NCKU OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS 2025, N.P.)

In the case of Bill Gates, we learn:

Over the next decade, advances in artificial intelligence will mean that humans will no longer be needed “for most things” in the world, says Bill Gates. That’s what the Microsoft co-founder and billionaire philanthropist told comedian Jimmy Fallon during an interview on NBC’s “The Tonight Show” in February. At the moment, expertise remains “rare,” Gates explained, pointing to human specialists we still rely on in many fields, including “a great doctor” or “a great teacher”. (HUDDLESTON Jr. 2025, N.P.)

Even if AI has the capacity to negatively encroach on our ways of life, its tremendous positive impacts cannot be overlooked, as it can also do the impossible: provide human material needs beyond imaginable limits. AI’s radical transformative characteristic, either positive or negative, will ever remain something to worry about. This naturally brings with it fears and apprehension concerning our livelihood and overall quality of life. Of all the radical changes AI is capable of bringing, the issue of encroachment into human personal autonomy remains one of high significance. This is important insofar as it is bound to reflect in diminished creativity, diminished freedom, and enhanced dependence on AI that is optimised to do things better and faster. What this means in the final analysis is that there is a fundamental transformation taking place without many taking notice. This type of silent transformation is such that it creates the illusion that addiction and dependence are sustainable new forms of personal autonomy and freedom. These are the types of illusions that constrain the human subject to seek its autonomy in AI, believing that AI has all that is needed to address issues of the human search for meaning adequately. Where this mode of AI conditioning persists, the tendency is for the human subject to seek its full autonomy in AI. We can now understand some of the reasons the human subject can mistake AI as the foundation of its unity and refrain from seeking it elsewhere, not even in the ego itself.

We see how, in the first analysis, the human subject insists on seeking the foundation of its unity outside of being that is complementarily constituted but seeks this in the ego that always strives to define the world in a unilateral, selfish mode always. In the AI era, this process is reversed such that the ego seeks the foundation of its unity completely outside and in AI. We are dealing here with a typical case of human consciousness suffering an internal rift that impacts the harmony of being and the totality of reality. Since AI is a human creation that does

not possess such a high level of ultimate legitimisation assigned to it by the human subject, such can only come from an agent that has the capacity to distort human perception of the world. This is the type of distortion that can be created by *ihē mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion). If such is allowed to persist, it is bound to complicate human relationships with the world generally and with human-AI interaction in very significant ways.

Realistic, Reasonable and Responsible Deployment of AI as an Ambivalent Technology

In the face of these difficult challenges, the question arises: how can we use AI realistically, reasonably and responsibly? To start with, the main issue is not whether AI is good or bad: as an ambivalent technology, what matters is how AI is deployed. Hence, to answer the question about realistic, reasonable and responsible use of AI entails a complete analysis of what AI is, how it relates to reason and consciousness within a complementary framework. This can be done as follows:

- 1) Defining AI and how it relates to its Human Creator
- 2) The inherent Unified and Complementary Character of Reason in Relationship to AI and its Human Creator
- 3) Consciousness in *Ibuanyidanda* Sense
- 4) Constraints Imposed by Utility focused Understanding of Reason as Technical Reason
- 5) What Realistic, Reasonable and Responsible use of AI entails

1. Defining AI and how it Relates to its Human Creator

The question now arises: what is AI? Defining AI is not something that follows the strict dictionary real type of definition. It is something that belongs to the province of nominal, functional or operational type of definition in tune with Aristotelian's categorisation (ASOUZU 1986, 7-11). This is important if we must capture the very nature of the ever evolving character of this technology. A cursory query of Gemini provides some insight from sources that strive to adapt their nominal mode of definition to the latest state of AI development. For the purpose of this essay, I have taken two of such sources.

- A. *Artificial Intelligence (AI) is a set of technologies that empowers computers to learn, reason, and perform a variety of advanced tasks in ways that used to require human intelligence, such as understanding language, analysing data, and even providing helpful suggestions. It's a transformational technology that can bring meaningful and positive change to people and societies and the world (GOOGLE CLOUD N.D.)*
- B. *An AI system is a machine-based system that, for explicit or implicit objectives, infers, from the input it receives, how to generate outputs such as predictions, content, recommendations, or decisions that can influence physical or virtual environments. Different AI systems vary in their levels of autonomy and adaptiveness after deployment (OECD ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE PAPERS 2024)*

The contrast between both definitions point to the tension between human and machine agency. While the first definition tries to bracket out the human agency altogether, the second upholds it. In other words, we are dealing here with the tension of autonomy between AI and its human creator. This notwithstanding, the human element will continue to play a very decisive role in the life of AI, even if *ihē mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion) will always tend to suggest otherwise. In other words, when we are thinking of AI, we are not dealing solely with machine-related issues alone. The idea of complete autonomy of AI is an illusion that is created in matters of this kind by *ihē mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion), and such that it endeavours to manipulate our perception of AI as to focus this on AI acting as an autonomous

agent. One thing is obvious: AI is not a matter of machine alone; it is grossly also a human affair. The complex and often perplexing mode of its operation notwithstanding, AI is still a human creation and the fruit of long years of scientific research. Although there is a symbiotic relationship between science, technology, and AI, the role the human subjects play in defining the goals of technology will always remain crucial and constitutive. There is an undeniable fascination attached to seeing AI becoming an autonomous agent; and something worth exploring. In the AI race, this appears to be one of the most important driving moments of AI development; something that fires the urge to optimise AI beyond all thinkable limits.

This is the idea behind the goal to automate all modes of existence thinkable: autonomous cars, autonomous military gadgets, and autonomous medical interventions, autonomous corporate entities, etc. As fascinating as these ideas can be, they also portend some of the greatest dangers in human-AI interaction: it is the wilful and insightful tendency to reduce human control and increase AI autonomy. The *mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion) can always becloud our judgements such that we tend to belittle, to forget and suppress the decisive role the human subject plays in these matters. There is a need not only to uphold the mutually complementary relationship between AI and its human creator, but also to see human control of AI as a non-negotiable aspect of human-AI interaction. For this reason, the apparent omnipotent outlook of AI notwithstanding, human beings have what it takes to steer technology and AI to whichever ends they want. The capacity to do this should also be seen as the obligation to do it; even if some seem to think otherwise or do not recognise how crucial this matter is. In the final effect, all AI matters are human matters. What we fail to see, at times, is that much of the advancements we attribute to AI are modes of human advancement and not machine innovation as such. This is unlikely to change even in the case of Artificial Super Intelligence. That is to say, in the final effect, it is humans that are responsible for the apparent innovations and complexities we see in AI. The impression, or should one say, the illusion that it is machine advancement only, is today complicated by the increased use of humanoids to portray AI intelligence. The human element remains a critical factor in the evolution of and deployment of AI always. We can say that AI turns out to be the capacity for machines to perform complex tasks that reflect the complex character of its human creator. At the centre of the whole process is human cogitation that computes and orders in tune with set goals deriving from codes and algorithms that drive AI. This is how, in this direction, AI is brought to life as an extension of our cognitive activities; as this is deployed to perform tasks more efficiently and quickly. In the same way, AI contributes to enhancing creativity and augmenting memory on the side of its human creator. It thereby helps in recalling those facts we are conversant with or may lack by way of presenting them with speed, near accurately and with a semblance of creativity. AI basically implies the transfer of human-like capabilities to a machine or robots as they perform those tasks that enhance human flourishing.

We encounter this interaction concretely in the ubiquitous generative AI tools like ChatGPT, Gemini, Grok, Copilot, Claude, Magisterium AI, Perplexity, Meta AI, and DeepSeek, which are powerful AI tools that are limited to the specific task of generating human-like texts based on their training data. The same is applicable to all those cases where we see AI in action, as in the cases of self-driving cars, which focus on navigating roads and avoiding obstacles; the same is the case with variants of robots and humanoid robots that have the capacity to perform human-like tasks in industry, in commerce, in entertainment, in medicine, domestically and in almost all areas they are deployed. In all these cases we talk of AI; with emphasis on intelligence. At this level, AI performs cognitive tasks but not yet in a comprehensive manner like its human creator. Amid the complex activities associated with AI, there is a tendency to forget that, behind the shadows, there remains an intrinsic connection between AI and its human creators. This difficulty of forgetfulness can create the illusion of complete autonomy of AI. This is why there is often the tendency to speculate on the level of

this autonomy; something that has given rise to the distinction between Artificial Narrow Intelligence (ANI), aka Weak AI, which is the AI in vogue at the moment, Artificial General Intelligence (AGI) and Artificial Super Intelligence (ASI). In the case of Artificial General Intelligence and Artificial Super Intelligence, the aim is to equal human-level intelligence and even surpass it. Even then, the speed and near accuracy with which ANI accomplishes cognitive human-like tasks is so impressive that many believe that in no distant future AI is bound to surpass human natural intelligence. This can only happen if humans, through negligence or due to the comfort provided by AI, abdicate their responsibility to machines such that speed and accuracy of presentation is mistaken for creativity and originality; and worst still is when such is mistaken for realistic, reasonable, and responsible resolution of complex issues. Where this happens, the loss of human personal autonomy is bound to become a real problem associated with realistic, reasonable, and responsible use of AI.

2. The inherent Unified and Complementary Character of Reason in Relationship to AI and its Human Creator

One can say that AI is a veritable fruit of decades of scientific investigations across multiple disciplines and among different peoples of the world. Here, science strives to provide the knowledge base upon which technology thrives. With AI, human efforts in the application of reason to resolve complex issues appear to be nearing their summit. This is especially the case if we remember that for Aristotle the human being is simply a rational animal by definition. In this way, AI turns out to be one of the finest modes of expression of reason; thereby contributing to solidifying the assumption by many that Aristotle's idea of an ideal human person stands vindicated. But this celebration of reason fails to understand that the human person is more than technical reason whose apparent summit is AI know-how. In other words, reason is more than what can be achieved by the application of complex machines-like intelligence. When reason in the form of AI, as technical reason, alone is celebrated at the cost of humanity, humanity is bound to be degraded. In this new dispensation, therefore, there is the need always to bear in mind the inherent unity within reason that has a complementary character. It is only in the application of reason as something inherently unified and complementary in its operations that the human subject can demonstrate what is special about the application of reason and not otherwise. Reason in all areas of its application always stays in a mode of unified intrinsic faculty. Where this character is compromised, crisis is bound to arise. What this reveals is that reason, knowledge generation, and AI, in order to uphold their true worth, have to strive always to sustain the intrinsic mutual complementary unity that defines their operations; a fact that reinforces their goals as something shared in common. Once this unified mutual dependence is created, it is then understandable how binding it becomes for all who share in this mode of determination to follow suit. Hence, understanding AI, how it impacts our world and how it can be intelligently and responsibly used makes it expedient always to bear in mind the complementary character of the diverse functions of reason upon which the human subject relies to address all important technical matters.

Human reason is definitely not a sterile faculty of cogitation whose apex is AI-like intelligence; and one that drives technological advancements. This is one of the mistakes we make when we say that humans are rational animals, where we equate rationality with progression that culminates in AI-like intelligence. When we make such a commitment, we are likely to be carried away by the highly impressive results associated with AI, and thereby forget that AI, as an ambivalent technology, can also present insurmountable challenges. This is understandable because this one-sided understanding of reason can very easily lead to fragmenting a faculty that should remain harmonised to perform its functions. Where our understanding of reason is fragmented, our approaches to life's challenges are bound to be fragmented. If, on the other hand, we approach reason in a harmonised and complementary mode, this is bound to resonate tremendously in the way we view reality generally. Hence, to

understand the enormous impact of AI in the world today, and what its realistic, reasonable, and responsible application can look like, it is always necessary to bear in mind its harmonised, complementary character with regard to its technical, practical, and theoretical functions.

3. *An Ibuanyidanda (Complementary) Understanding of Consciousness beyond Sentient and Machine/AI induced Challenges*

Generally, the faculty of reason finds expression in its theoretical, practical, and technical functions. Questions concerning this mode of expression of reason have preoccupied philosophers more intensively since the time of Emmanuel Kant, who famously argued that because theoretical reason cannot prove or disprove metaphysical concepts like God, the soul, or free will, practical reason has the right to “postulate” them. The question then intensifies: how exactly is human reason constituted in its function, and what is it capable of? Theoretical reason deals directly with what we believe in terms of epistemic norms. On its side, practical reason concerns itself with normative actions or what is commanded. Technical reason relates to what is produced, how or the means for production. Difficulties arise the moment these functions of reason are fragmented such that we view them as discrete quantities acting within the same human subject. Where this happens, an artificial divide is immediately introduced within a faculty that should remain unified and complementary in its operations. In the use of reason, where this sort of fragmentation is consummated, it is bound to resonate in the ways the ego views the world and conducts itself in basic and complex matters. This is when we say that there is a divide in the internal workings of human consciousness in the use and application of reason. By consciousness, within an ibuanyidanda framework, I refer to the capacity of the human subject to relate to the world in a complementary harmonious mode; as to affirm existent realities insightfully and consistently as missing links that are in a mutual complementary relationship. Attempts at researching into consciousness often have to contend with the tendency to make recourse to extreme forms of dualistic measures in view of giving insightful answers into the character of a phenomenon that has always perplexed the inquirer. This is applicable not only to some of those research efforts that delve into the nature of consciousness in animals but more so to those that inquire into this phenomenon as a human capacity, and now also as this relates to the possibility of AI being conscious. As this matter relates specifically to the way consciousness is structured as a human attribute, the moment we seek to determine its nature as something that is localised, for example, we thereby assume that the type of answer demanded is something that is world-immanently given. This is an area that has to be borne in mind always when researching into consciousness in the philosophy of mind.

Here, the works of Matthias Michel and Earl Miller of the MIT Consciousness Club need to be mentioned. They seek to resolve this matter as a collaborative effort: while Matthias Michel (2025) concentrates on the epistemology of measurement, Earl Miller (2025) focuses on the physical mechanisms of the brain, specifically the prefrontal cortex and neural dynamics, to explore the nature. Peter Godfrey-Smith’s research efforts are significant insofar as he is best known for his work exploring the evolutionary origins of consciousness, particularly in marine life. For him, consciousness has more to do with a process that is biologically given and gradual in its evolution (@CloserToTruthTV 2026). In the case of collaboration between philosophy and neuroscience, the puzzle remains why and how physical processes, neural activity for example, give rise to subjective experience. Any attempt to deal with the neural correlates of consciousness has to contend with an equally intractable problem; it is that of how to deal with the intricate nature of reality that resists all forms of world-immanent pre-determinism. Reality resists any form of world-immanent pre-deterministic approaches. This notwithstanding the *mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion) can deceive us into assuming that, by recourse to the most advanced tools made possible by AI and allied technologies, we can measure and depict how consciousness, as intricate as it is, derives from specific material, biological and physical components. Where we are committed to this type of

approach, we can easily forget that each of these constituent parts of any given entity is in turn constituted of innumerable, and often interminable, mutually complementing parts, which need to be accounted for always; if not now, but sometime in the future as reality keeps evolving. More often than not, all answers given at any given point and place are merely provisional. This is why, in matters of this kind, all options are open; and such that makes complementary dependence in seeking answers mandatory as we seek to give an accurate account of reality in a future-related mode, and most especially as this relates to such complex phenomena as consciousness. A complementary type of realism does not allow for such rigid, mechanistic, and technology-given answers only. However, where such machine-inspired answers are already in place, they are still very useful since anything that exists serves as a missing link. They are useful insofar as they contribute to revealing reality as something that serves as a missing link in a future-related mode.

On the other hand, their realistic and responsible worth, their meaningfulness, their reasonableness diminish in the measure they are pursued with a divisive exclusivist type of mind-set; something that can inadvertently lead to saying what consciousness is not. This is why the high hopes raised by AI and allied technologies in resolving such intricate matters as consciousness can very easily mislead us, even today, to draw the same conclusion of a Cartesian 17th century illusion. This is precisely the attempt to identify the pineal gland as the principal seat of the soul and the central point of the mind (soul) body interaction. Even in our highly advanced technological age, we are not immune to this type of reductionist realist dualism. On the contrary, the mmeghari anya (third-tier perception or illusion) has a way of boosting human confidence due to what can be accomplished by recourse to AI and allied technologies and such that we commit the same errors many times over. This is why it is important today that the different sciences researching matters of consciousness pool their resources through mutually complementary collaboration, devoid of any form of exclusivist reasoning. Here, there is always a need to bear in mind the character of reality that, in its interminable complementary constitution, continues to reveal itself in a future-related mode. It is this interminable complementary structure of reality that reveals to us that every form of analysis achievable in matters of consciousness is merely provisional. In dealing with consciousness, we are not dealing, for example, with neural activities, with electrical and chemical processes; we are dealing with how such activities can be grasped within the context of an interminable number of relations that keep unfolding. These are relations constituted of neurons, atoms, visible and invisible, actual and potential, spiritual and material, known and unknown, as they interrelate to constitute reality interminably. It is when we fail to observe this mode of interminable relations that we may end up stating what consciousness is not. What this means is that a purely technical or purely speculative approach in this matter can hardly yield satisfactory results as we seek insight into what it means to be conscious or what constitutes a self-conscious act. Apparently, encouraged by advances in AI technologies, some strive to give a purely technological answer to this matter. We see this in the intensified efforts today to locate and measure consciousness in neuroscience, focusing on identifying specific neural correlates of consciousness (NCC). Quite understandably, such efforts are inspired by the rapid advancement of AI and can be very useful for better medical diagnostics. As well-intentioned as these efforts are, they serve as a missing link of reality and are as such, realistic; but in the measure they help us affirm all existent realities as missing links for the joy of being. This is important when we remember that consciousness is something the human subject shares even with other sentient beings. For this reason, knowledge gained in these areas, be they biology or neuron-based, is bound to be beneficial to human overall wellbeing somehow. The usefulness of such insights is bound to be amplified in the measure they are complementarily structured.

Concretely still, such approaches have to bear in mind that reality is not constituted only of measurable phenomena that are accessible only as discrete quantities; and as such consisting of distinct neurons and biological properties. It is the same difficulty we encounter when we assume that AI language models should mirror cognitive intelligence in order to maximise human potentialities, without taking into account the role other faculties of reason play in such complex and delicate matters. This is how world-immanent, technology-driven approaches treat reason as fragmented. For this reason, they often focus on understanding how the brain processes speech acts, how cognitive intelligence can impact productivity by recourse to machine learning. They thereby fail to understand that for machine language to be able to mirror human language or behaviour effectively, it has to do so by understanding the type of harmonised complementary unity that exists in reason itself. In other words, such approaches seek to address only cognitive intelligence but fail to address the faculty of reason in the totality of its constitution as a unified harmonious faculty. One can say that generally these are efforts aiming to employ all advanced tools made possible by AI today to try to resolve an issue that demands a complex form of complementary approach. The temptation to handle such intricate matters as purely physical and technical issues is always given, especially in an AI era with its promises of making the impossible possible. This is when *Ihe mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion) can very easily embolden the human subject to be very daring and, in the process, purely technical answers are given to issues that demand a more differentiated approach beyond the impositions of the senses. It is not a mark of weakness to understand that the human subject is not constituted purely of matter alone; neither is reality constituted only of certain fixed elements. Where we forget this fact, we are bound to be committed to a type of realism that does not unite, but one that divides and approaches reality with a divisive exclusivist type of mind-set. Attending to reality in a complementary realist mode always bears in mind the complementary constitution of reality, and it has the capacity to broaden our perspective in a way that prepares us to always venture into the unknown. By taking to world-immanent dualistic approaches, we can very easily foreclose the richness of the future that is always evolving. Naturally, matters relating to consciousness have more to do with the way this faculty is shared with all sentient beings. In relation to the human person, it takes on a special character as something that contributes to shaping human identity in very significant ways. This is why, when we are talking of consciousness, we have to bear this important point in mind always.

In its relationship with reason, human consciousness processes data in tune with the mode in which information is presented. Where reason is fragmented, it will always try to present data in the most disjointed mode, and can thereby hardly relate with consciousness in a unified, smoothest mode. Where the data is disjointed and divisive, we tend to perceive and judge reality in a disjointed, divisive mode. In seeking a complementary solution to this important matter, I bear in mind always the complex character of reality generally, of which the human subject is merely a fraction of the whole. Consciousness, as the mover of the human subject within this complex set-up, has to address the totality of reality as this impacts the human subject. In this way, the human subject makes recourse to consciousness to address both the known and unknown regions of reality, and as these are revealed in a future-related mode. Any inquiry delving into these areas has to be equipped with the requisite tools. That is why I make recourse to the transcendent categories of unity of consciousness (*akara obi* or *akara mmuo*) to give a comprehensive account of what I understand by consciousness. In this connection, I make reference to what I called in the Igbo language of Nigeria the state of “*ima-onwe-onye*” as the ideal depiction of the state of consciousness, as it finds expression in the human subject (ASOUZU 2007, 327-346). This is the state at which consciousness goes beyond the type we find in non-human sentient beings and in hypothetical machines or the AI type of consciousness. It is in this state that ego knows itself and what it is worth and how it is

constituted. In this state, the ego discovers itself, insightfully and consistently, as a being whose existence is made possible only in relationship with all possible forms of relations. It is the state of individuality as it is carried, insightfully and consistently, into the totality through which the realisations of its existence become concrete as something relational. This is that awareness deriving from being above such impositions that make world-immanence self-constituting. It is for this reason that, in this state, the human subject has the capacity to transcend insightfully and consistently the constraints and impositions arising from the senses as it affirms all existent realities as missing links that are in mutual complementary relationship for the joy of being. We can then say that a given human subject is in the measure conscious as it has the capacity to affirm, insightfully and consistently, all existent realities as missing links that are in mutual complementary relationship for the joy of being. Herein subsists also the future-related character of this intricate act which is bound to be constitutive in the way we research into consciousness and what it depicts. It is in this highly elevated state of being self-conscious as *ima-onwe-onye* that the ego strives insightfully and consistently to overcome our ambivalent, tension-laden existential situations that are beclouded by the phenomenon of concealment (*ihe mkpuchi anya*) and complicated by *ihe mmeghari anya* (third tier perception or illusion). The advantage of this approach is that it offers us the groundwork for articulating the issue of consciousness as it relates to all sentient beings, just as it provides the condition for asking questions about AI being conscious.

4. *Constraints Imposed by Utility focused Understanding of Reason as Technical Reason*

We can then understand the impact a disjointed, disharmonised idea of reason can have on our notion and use of AI. We make such mistakes when we conceive reason as structured in a way that some of its parts are designed to address some primary duties at the expense of others; as in the case where the primacy of practical over theoretical and technical reason is amplified and upheld. Again, we encounter this in all those methods of scientific investigation and human activities that tend to define their subject matter and goals in terms of utility, profit, and production. By so doing, the emphasis is on technical reason; what it can achieve and how to enhance and optimise its use. This appears to be the most preferred approach in matters dealing with AI, where the focus is often on what AI can produce and achieve, in terms of utility and profit. Handling reason in this fragmented mode impacts directly the way human consciousness as a whole reacts to our world and processes data. A fragmented conception of reason has the tendency to divide and polarise reality and not unite and harmonise it. Such a conception of reason will hardly be in a position to see the inherent necessity of affirming reality as missing links that are in a mutually complementary relationship. What is more, an understanding that relates to the world in this disjointed, disharmonious mode can have wide-reaching implications for the way we relate to the world generally. Again, such a conception of reason can hardly notice that it can be drawn into difficulties on account of some constraints emanating from the outside. This failure can be accounted for because in all such cases, the ego is already part of a world that is highly challenged by *ihe mmeghari anya* (third-tier perception or illusion). It is a world in which actors prefer divisive and exclusivist measures to resolve contentious issues. Worst still is when contentious issues are motivated by profit and other utility-driven considerations. This is why I maintain that a human subject is in the degree consciousness as it is in a position to act in a complementary mode and so much so that acting in a self-conscious mode entails all it takes to affirm reality insightfully as missing links, including those who do not share our views, our lifestyle and values. This can hardly happen where reason, in its functions, is divided and consciousness fragmented. Any utility-based and profit-driven approach to AI will struggle with a divided consciousness, as its goals are set and determined by a technical reason that focuses on goals that are primarily technology-driven. When this happens, the human subject is hardly capable of realising the truth of affirming missing links as mutually complementary, since its goals are already set by motives that are

inherently divisive. This is precisely why, in its actions, the ego struggles and contends with compromised consciousness about the true nature of what is needed to act authentically. By consciousness, I mean the personal insightful affirmation of all existent realities as missing links in a mutually complementary relationship for the joy of being. Being conscious in this complementary sense has more to do with acting with all the faculties of reason fully harmonised and one that does not discriminate, is not exclusivist and does not divide to dominate.

That idea of reason as technical reason, driven by utility, ambition and other purely world-immanent pre-deterministic considerations gives the impression that all that can be had in the use of AI is its ability to enhance means of production, enhance prestige, edge out competitors and perfect distribution and consumption patterns and processes; thereby help in maximising profit. When this fact is measured from the very high expectations already raised by the capacity of AI to perform tasks relatively quicker and more efficiently, we are deceived into believing that AI has the answer to all our aspirations; especially when it fulfils certain expectations. Approaches of this kind have an inherent tendency to fragment reason, absolutise AI and ascribe to it characteristics it does not have as a relative tool of human creation. Here, we are dealing directly with a flawed and fragmented mode of applying reason as opposed to our understanding of reason as a harmonised and harmonising faculty. Those approaches that mischaracterise our understanding of reason have the capacity always to becloud our judgement with regard to knowing that human reason also has theoretical and practical functions that are equally important in the way they contribute to constituting and founding reason. Basically, however, consciousness resists this form of fragmentation and this pre-deterministic understanding and application of reason, even if unintentional. Where we persist in applying reason in this divisive mode, we only succeed in further stressing consciousness, which struggles to come to terms with a one-dimensional, divisive, and exclusivist application of reason. On account of this stressed situation, tension arises within consciousness itself, and one relating to the misuse of technical reason in exclusion of its theoretical and practical modes of expression. So stressed reason and consciousness sink into a state of broken unity that finds expression in all the crises that are associated with the fear attributed to AI as a product of reason. Among others is the fear that AI can turn things around and lord it over its human creators in the mode of the servant lording it over his master. This is the scary scenario Dario Amodei, Anthropic CEO, has in mind when he outlines the “short-, medium-, and long-term risks associated with unrestricted AI: the technology will first present bias and misinformation, as it does now. Next, it will generate harmful information using enhanced knowledge of science and engineering, before finally presenting an existential threat by removing human agency, potentially becoming too autonomous and locking humans out of systems” (ROGELBERG 2026). Recourse to a one-dimensional application of reason can make us blind and becloud our judgement with regard to such real existential threats. By following the straight course of undifferentiated understanding of reason, we proceed in a way that can put us on a collision course with our own invention. By so doing we risk becoming the very architects of our own misfortune without realising this fully. In other words, the moment we are conditioned to think in terms of utility, profit, prestige, edging out competitors, enhancement of productivity and efficient distribution, in tune with the dictates of technical reason, we are bound to be forgetful of alternative ways of seeking solutions and formulating our questions. What this means is that the moment we perceive human reason as a faculty constituted of distinct and fragmented parts, that is the moment also we approach reality with a divisive and disjointed type of mind-set, with all the severe consequences this entails.

5. *What Realistic, Reasonable, and Responsible use of AI entails*

Realistic, reasonable, and responsible use of AI therefore depends on the way we approach it as an ambivalent technology. Its many benefits notwithstanding, it is still viewed as one of the

most potentially lethal technologies ever invented if mismanaged. This is why the issue of deploying AI reasonably and responsibly matters a lot. Hence, if we must remain relevant and uphold our autonomy as self-conscious, responsible individuals who cherish taking their destiny into their own hands, then what we invest in understanding AI as an ambivalent multifunctional technology is very decisive. This is important because, as users of AI and its products, our self-understanding and the way we understand reason go a long way in determining the way we use AI. This is why the goals we set for ourselves and the types of mind-set we use in pursuing such goals deserve careful review always. Where these goals are purely technology and utility based and driven, AI will continue to pose some of those dangers we all fear. Quite unfortunately, pursuing goals that are technology and utility driven appears to be one of the most preferred strategies that propel AI integration. This derives from the fact that our knowledge of AI is very much tied to technical reason. This is one of the major reasons AI is bound to keep encroaching into human autonomy due to our insatiable desires that make total dependence on AI and allied technologies inevitable. The question will always remain how to mediate its gains and the dangers it poses such that humanity can reap its bountiful benefits without it constituting real danger to its beneficiaries. This can only happen where the mind-set deployed in all AI related matters is harmonising. It is only in this way that humanity can use it without becoming the very architects of their own misfortune. For this to happen, there is always a need to bear in mind that the *faculty of reason is not constituted by technical reason only. The moment technical reason is prioritised in matters of AI at the exclusion of other faculties of reason, then AI is not being used reasonably and responsibly.* This is why, as something designed to address human needs comprehensively, AI must address the totality of reason-gear challenges. This is why a more comprehensive approach to the use of AI is mandatory. This comprehensive approach is possible only within a complementary framework where the mind-set with which goals are set and pursued must reflect the character of reason. If the mind-set is harmonising, the use and deployment of AI are bound to be harmonising as well; and the converse is the case. Hence, in matters dealing with AI, the mind-set invested in generating programs and algorithms, writing code, structuring machine language, machine learning and training deserves attention always. In this respect, those directly entrusted with such matters have a significant role to play in determining how AI is used.

Generally, though, the same can be said of scientists of all persuasions across a wider spectrum who contribute to bringing AI to life. It is still a concern for consumers of the technology themselves. Those sciences and attitudes that have the capacity to broaden their perspectives, widen their subject matter and range of applicability beyond mere utility, and meet the demands of technical reason have a better chance of contending with the challenges AI raises. The task will always be how best to harmonise our interests with those pursued by AI, integrate our self-understanding along lines of the internal workings of AI such that they remain in harmony with the way reason and consciousness form a harmonised whole. This is one of the greatest challenges in our dealings with AI: it is a matter of finding a credible solution to the challenge of how the human subject can operate at the same wavelength with AI, or at least approximate the same wavelength in its dealings with AI. In more concrete terms, this denotes the need to ensure that what we desire and think as human beings is reflected sufficiently adequately in the codes and algorithms deployed in machine training and learning; and all erected firmly on a complementary basis. These are some of the basic measures needed so that we can reap the benefits of AI while still controlling it and, in the process, demonstrate our capacity to use AI intelligently and reasonably. If there is any good to be derived from the intrinsic complementary relationship between AI, its human creator, and reason, it is that it points to the need to better understand how AI relates to the whole of human cognitive activities and to the complex nature of the internal workings of human consciousness. Handling these issues adequately entails understanding better the foundation of the unity between AI and

reason; between AI, reason and consciousness. Any approach that should be adequate in handling these matters should also be able to integrate into its method and principles ways of probing into the faculty of reason as to determine how it relates to human consciousness in the most harmonious complementary natural way possible. This is important because the way we conceptualise human reason in relation to consciousness is bound to play a crucial role in how we address the most complex issues connected with AI in our technologically advanced age. Within the context of Ibuanyidanda philosophy, I have identified this as an expanded attempt to probe more intensely into the faculty of reason and its relationship with consciousness. By so doing, I bear in mind also the very important role ihe mmeghari anya (third-tier perception or illusion) plays in the whole process.

Conclusion

Rooted in the framework of ibuanyidanda realism (complementary realism), this essay reframes AI safety as a fundamentally noetic and philosophical challenge, rather than a purely technical or external problem. AI safety, therefore, cannot be reduced to a matter of efficient coding, improved algorithms, or the optimal deployment of machine-learning techniques. Instead, the essay redirects attention from technical safety protocols to the deeper philosophical and noetic dimensions that shape human-AI interaction. As a profoundly noetic matter, any fatal error in human judgment inevitably reverberates through the ways AI is designed, interpreted, and deployed. The vulnerability of human cognition to ihe mmeghari anya (third-tier perception or illusion) further complicates this issue. This phenomenon generates a radical deception that blurs the boundaries of truth between the real and the ideal, between being and its attributes; thus, challenging human reason in unprecedented ways. Under its influence, the human subject may begin to project AI as an omnipotent surrogate deity endowed with a mystical aura. Once this illusion becomes internalised, it distorts the human relationship with both reality and AI. Such a perception encourages accountability evasion and AI-blaming, where humans shift responsibility for errors onto an AI imagined as all-powerful and whose complex mode of operation is often not fully understood. Even more troubling is the ease with which actors may hide behind the perceived complexity and anonymity of AI systems to pursue selfish or harmful goals. The reach of ihe mmeghari anya extends across domains, reinforcing tendencies to misuse the advantages AI provides and amplifying transhumanist and post-humanist aspirations that promise the impossible through technological transcendence. This challenge is not confined to science and technology alone; it is also present in the uncritical confidence many places in AI's capacity to make the impossible possible. Providing insight into how these fundamental noetic challenges can be resolved turns out to be one of the effective means needed to address some of the biases inherent in today's AI protocols.

Declarations

*The author declares no conflict of interest or ethical issues for this work.

Relevant Literature

1. AGADA, Ada. [Existence and Consolation: Reinventing Ontology, Gnosis, And Values in African Philosophy], 2015. Paragon House: Minnesota.
2. ASOUZU, Innocent. [Gedanken über die Religiöse Problematik der Gegenwart im Licht der Theologie der Religionen: Eine Reflexion im Anschluss an Wolfhart Pannenberg], 1986. Peter Lang Verlag: Frankfurt am Main.

3. _____. [Ibuanyidanda (complementary Reflection) and Some Basic Philosophical Problems in Africa Today: Sense Experience,” Ihe Mkpuchi Anya” and the Super-maxim], 2013. Lit Verlag: Münster.
4. _____. [Ibuanyidanda and the Philosophy of Essence”. 50th Inaugural Lecture of University of Calabar], 2011. University of Calabar Press: Calabar.
5. _____. [Ibuanyidanda. New Complementary Ontology. Beyond World-Immanentism, Ethnocentric Reduction and Impositions], 2007. Lit Verlag: Münster.
6. _____. [The Method and Principles of Complementary Reflection in and Beyond African Philosophy], 2005. Lit Verlag: Münster.
7. _____. [The Method and Principles of Complementary Reflections in and Beyond African Philosophy], 2004. University of Calabar Press: Calabar.
8. CHIMAKONAM, Jonathan O. [Ezumezu: A System of Logic for African Philosophy and Studies], 2019. Springer Publishers: Cham.
9. EBOESOMI, Sharon. “UPDATED: Reps. probe \$460m Abuja CCTV Project funded by China Loan.” [Premium Times], N.P., October 22, 2025.
10. GODFREY-SMITH, Peter. [Other Minds: The Octopus, The Sea, and the Deep Origins of Consciousness], 2016. Farrar, Straus and Giroux: New York.
11. GOOGLE CLOUD. “Artificial Intelligence (AI): a Simple-to-Understand Guide.” [Google Cloud], N.P.
12. HUDDLESTON Jr, Tom. “Bill Gates: within 10 Years, AI Will Replace Many Doctors and Teachers- ‘Humans Would Be Needed for Most Things.’ [CNBC Make It], N.P., March 26, 2025.
13. IJIOMAH, Chris. [Harmonious Monism: A Philosophical Logic of Explanation for Ontological Issues in Supernaturalism in African Thought], 2016. Xlibris Corporation: US.
14. KIMMERLE, Heinz. “An Amazing Piece of Comparative Philosophy.” [Confluence: Online Journal of World Philosophies], pp221-223, 2014. Vol 1.
15. MA, Jason. “‘Godfather of AI’ says the Technology will Create Massive Unemployment and Send Profits Soaring — ‘that is the Capitalist System’.” [Fortune], N.P., January 12, 2026.
16. MICHEL, Matthias. “Sensory Horizons and Visual Consciousness in Non-Human Animal.” [YouTube], N.P., Nov 18, 2025.
17. MICHEL, Matthias. “The Mismeasure of Consciousness: A problem of coordination for the Perceptual Awareness Scale.” [Philosophy of Science], pp1239-1249, 2019. Vol 86. No5.
18. MILLER, Earl K. & COHEN, Jonathan D. “An Integrative Theory of Prefrontal Cortex Function.” [Annual Review of Neuroscience], pp167-202, 2001. Vol 24. No1.
19. Miller, Earl K. “Cognition Emerges from Neural Dynamics.” [YouTube], N.P., Nov 21, 2025.
20. Nagel, Ernest, “Value-oriented Bias of Social Inquiry,” [Society and the Social Sciences: An Introduction, David POTTER Ed.], pp406-417, 1981. Routledge: London.
21. NCKU Office of International Affairs. “NCKU Kicks Off “NCKU Meets Nobel” Series with Nobel Laureate Sir Christopher Pissarides on AI and the Future of Work.” [NCKU], N.P., December 10, 2025.
22. O’DONNELL, James. “OpenAI’s “Compromise” with the Pentagon is what Anthropic Feared.” [MIT Technology Review], N.P., March 2, 2026.
23. OECD. “Explanatory Memorandum on the Updated OECD Definition of An AI System.” [OECD], N.P., March 2024.

24. Olumba, Ezenwa. "Nigeria's Armed Groups are entering the Drone Age, and the State must Respond." [[Africa at LSE](#)], N.P., February 17, 2026.
25. OZUMBA, Godwin. [Philosophy & Method of Integrative Humanism], 2010. Jochrisam Publishers: Calabar.
26. PwC GLOBAL ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE STUDY. "Sizing the Prize" [[PwC](#)], N.P., January 19, 2026.
27. ROGELBERG, Sasha. "'I'm Deeply Uncomfortable': Anthropic CEO Warns that a Cadre of AI Leaders, including Himself, Should Not Be in Charge of the Technology's Future." [[Fortune](#)], N.P., February 19, 2026.
28. RUSSELL, Bertrand. The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell: 1944-1969. Simon and Schuster: New York.
29. SALEEM, Fahad. "Elon Musk Says You Don't 'Have to Go to College' Because 'Supersonic Tsunami' of AI Will Make Learning Skills 'Unnecessary'." [[Yahoo!News](#)], N.P., February 4, 2026.
30. @CLOSEROTRUTHTV. "Peter Godfrey-Smith - Philosophy of Evolutionary Cognition, Emotion, & Consciousness." [[YouTube](#)], N.P., March 19, 2026.