

Local synthesis of 1st and 2nd waves of societal discussions

France - Democracy

In 2023, discussions on what it means to be human in the time of neuroscience (NS) and AI have been facilitated by NHNAI partners in 9 different countries. In each country, 3 lines of discussions have been opened to explore this question in the **3 thematic fields of education, health, and democracy**. Each partner then produced **3 local syntheses** reporting on the content of discussions in these 3 fields in the corresponding countries.*

This document presents **ideas of the local synthesis in France**, about discussions on **democracy**, organized by Lille Catholic University.



* For an exact total of 8*3 + 2 local syntheses. In Canada (Québec), Cégep Sainte-Foy organized discussions focused on Democracy and Education, but not on Health.

Table of contents

Part 1: Salient ideas of 2023 4

The rise of artificial intelligence raises concerns about privacy, illustrated by massive access to personal data by private and public entities (5 extracts)	4
The complex question of the legal status of artificial intelligence is widely debated. (5 extracts)	5
Artificial Intelligence (AI) is currently perceived as a powerful tool, although it remains, for the moment, limited compared to the complexity and diversity of human brain capabilities. (5 extracts)	5
AI and social media underscore the need to make recommendation algorithms more transparent to foster critical thinking (5 extracts)	6
Reflection on the use of algorithms emphasizes that it's the human application compromising our critical sense, rather than the algorithms themselves (4 extracts)	7
The challenges and dilemmas surrounding the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in social media moderation are perceived as significant issues (5 extracts)	8
There is concern about the risk of targeting and oppression by authoritarian regimes through algorithms (5 extracts)	8
Participants express worries about the prospect of being able to create a duplicate or an improved version of themselves (3 extracts)	9
The complexity of privacy in the digital age is a crucial issue (5 extracts)	9
Desirable: Transparency of recommendation algorithms (2 extracts)	10
Desirable: Algorithms remain tools (1 extract)	11
Desirable: Some participants also questioned the maintenance of what they consider to be an important boundary between the private and public spheres (2 extracts)	11
Undesirable: The recognition of a legal personality for AIs is not desirable (2 extract)	12

Part 2 : Salient ideas of 2024 13

AIs are for services to humans (5 extracts)	13
Ethical challenge for AIs: risks, inequality and human nature (5 extracts)	13
Personal data: between commercial exploitation, surveillance and necessary regulation (5 extracts)	14
Between freedom and security: the challenges of data collection and AI in a digital world (4 extracts)	15
Artificial intelligence: between ethical limits, rights and human control (5 extracts)	16
Dual use of technology: Benefits and dangers for freedom and privacy (3 extracts)	16
Compromises for AIs benefits (4 extracts)	17

Individual liberty and democracy (5 extracts)	18
For a real informed consent (4 extracts)	19
Responsibility: a difficult frontier (4 extracts).....	19
AI's and moral frontier of humanity (3 extracts)	20
Desirable: AI: between the challenges of interaction and the promise of innovation. (3 extracts)	21
Desirable: Need for regulation, education and critical awareness (3 extracts).....	21
Undesirable: The risks of surveillance and loss of personal freedom (3 extract).....	22
Undesirable: Ethical and Social Challenges of Artificial Intelligence: Fears, Inequalities and Questioning Fundamental Values (3 extracts)	23

Part 1: Salient ideas of 2023

The rise of artificial intelligence raises concerns about privacy, illustrated by massive access to personal data by private and public entities (5 extracts)

Description of the idea: The rise of artificial intelligence raises concerns about privacy, illustrated by massive access to personal data by private and public entities. However, this threat has long been extending to the poorest populations, highlighting existing social inequalities. The need to ensure transparency and accountability in the development of AI and social media is emphasized to counter targeted disinformation. To protect democracy, it is imperative to strengthen privacy protection laws, promote a culture of understanding AI issues, and clearly distinguish between private and public life. This distinction is essential to preserve democracy and ensure individual freedom. Finally, the importance of protecting public opinions and rejecting the notion of "I have nothing to hide" is emphasized, highlighting the potential dangers of algorithms that reinforce existing opinions rather than fostering diversity of perspectives.

Corresponding extracts

1. "L'IA ne fait qu'ajouter des menaces. Par exemple en France les algorithmes de la CAF (Caisse D'Allocations Familiales), sous prétexte de détecter les fraudes, accèdent à des milliers de données personnelles (comptes bancaires, salaires et autres revenus, avec qui vous vivez, etc.). »
2. « On se préoccupe aujourd'hui de notre vie privée avec l'IA. Mais pour les populations les plus pauvres leur vie privée est d'ores et déjà menacée depuis longtemps. »
3. « Nous devons protéger la démocratie, renforcer nos institutions d'intérêt public et les lois sur la protection de la vie privée et la sécurité des données, encourager l'éducation et la sensibilisation au sujet de l'IA. »
4. « En effet, il est important de garder cette distinction. Le mélange de vie privé et vie publique n'est jamais bon. Ce concept est important pour le fondement de la démocratie, cela permet également de garantir une certaine liberté. »
5. « Je ne supporte pas cette idée-là. J'essaie un maximum de dégoogliser mon ordinateur, d'utiliser d'autres moteurs de recherche. Au début je le prenais un peu en dilettante en disant "oui, de toute façon on s'en fout", avec ces arguments insupportables que j'ai utilisés "je n'ai rien à cacher", sauf que non. Il y avait eu quelqu'un qui m'avait dit simplement "mais mettons à un moment tu vois quelqu'un en train de lire ton journal intime, si t'as rien à cacher tu t'en fous". Mais en fait non. Non, tu ne t'en moques pas, car c'est toi ; et le fait qu'en plus tes données elles sont utilisées, là, clairement, pour en faire commerce, pour que l'algorithme te montre pleins de trucs qui vont dans ton sens, que ce soit au niveau juste de ce que tu as envie d'acheter mais au niveau même idéologique, il n'y a que des choses qui vont dans ton sens. Donc ça enferme un petit peu chacun dans ses opinions, ça ne pousse pas à aller voir ailleurs puisque toutes les données récupérées poussent, je ne pense pas forcément à internet, mais pousse internet à montrer des choses qui vont dans ton sens et pas qui vont te contredire. »

The complex question of the legal status of artificial intelligence is widely debated (5 extracts)

Description of the idea: The complex question of the legal status of artificial intelligence is widely debated. Key ideas include the notion that current AI lacks consciousness and cannot be considered a "subject of rights." Some contemplate the possibility of granting specific rights to advanced AIs, while others highlight difficulties in distinguishing the interests of AI from those of its owner. Some believe that the future evolution of AI might eventually justify the creation of a new legal category. However, the majority agrees that current AI lacks consciousness and emotions comparable to those of humans, raising doubts about its qualification as a "subject of rights." Finally, there are concerns about the potential confusion of responsibilities and blurring of boundaries between machines and humans by granting rights to AIs.

In tension with:

- Salient idea: Maybe, some AI can assume a type of responsibility.
- Salient idea: A new legal status is necessary for some AI.

Corresponding extracts

1. « L'IA n'a pas de conscience, elle ne pourrait donc en aucun cas être considérée comme "sujet de droits" même d'un point de vue éthique elle ne peut atteindre un niveau de conscience suffisant pour être considérée comme des entités autonomes. »
2. « Si l'IA est capable de prendre des décisions autonomes, d'avoir des émotions, on pourrait lui accorder une reconnaissance et certains autres aspects similaires aux êtres humains, ce qui n'est pas le cas. »
3. « Cela pourrait être une approche intéressante mais il semble difficile de distinguer les intérêts du robot de ceux de son propriétaire ou de son utilisateur, l'IA est avant tout un objet de droit et non un sujet de droit. »
4. « Le développement de l'IA pourrait-il justifier la création d'une nouvelle catégorie juridique de personne, notamment en fonction de la plus ou moins grande autonomie du robot en question. »
5. « La question de savoir si l'IA peut devenir un "sujet de droits" est complexe et soulève des questionnements éthiques et juridiques. »

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is currently perceived as a powerful tool, although it remains, for the moment, limited compared to the complexity and diversity of human brain capabilities (5 extracts)

Description of the idea: Artificial Intelligence (AI) is currently perceived as a powerful tool, although it remains, for the moment, limited compared to the complexity and diversity of human brain capabilities. Despite ongoing progress in AI, it remains specialized in specific domains and lacks consciousness or interests separate from its creators. The relationship between humans and machines is often described as that of a person using a powerful tool. Despite its lack of creativity or imagination, AI has become proficient in various domains, ranging from games (such as Go and chess) to more complex activities (such as art). While significant advancements are observed, a considerable "gap" persists between the potential of the human brain and the current capabilities of AI. Some believe that AI, in conjunction

with neuroscience, could contribute to improving democracy by facilitating the collection and analysis of data for more informed decision-making, emphasizing the need to keep it as a tool in the daily lives of humans.

In tension with:

- **Salient idea: Ais can be a tool to improve the democracy exercise, and redefine the notion of responsibility.**

Corresponding extracts

1. « Mais bien qu'en considérant une évolution immense dans l'IA, le rapport homme/machine restera encore longtemps celui d'une personne se servant d'un outil, bien que très performant. »
2. « Bien que les machines soient de plus en plus complexes et de plus en plus performantes, une IA est jusqu'à maintenant et encore pour quelque temps toujours experte dans un seul domaine, ce qui met encore en évidence l'écart considérable surtout sur la variété de domaines couverts par une machine en comparaison de l'humain. »
3. « Justement une IA est concentrée sur une seule activité contrairement au cerveau qui lui a la capacité de faire un très très grand nombre d'activités. Elle n'atteint donc pas encore la complexité du cerveau. Il reste bien un "gap" considérable entre les deux. »
4. « L'intelligence artificielle reste un outil pour l'homme et n'a pas de volonté ou d'intérêt distincts de celui qui la possède ou la crée. Il semble donc que l'IA ne puisse pas posséder de personnalité juridique propre. »
5. « L'IA et les neurosciences peuvent aider à améliorer la démocratie en permettant une meilleure collecte et analyse de données pour une prise de décision plus éclairée. Cela peut également aider à identifier les biais et les préjugés dans les processus décisionnels et à les corriger. »

AI and social media underscore the need to make recommendation algorithms more transparent to foster critical thinking (5 extracts)

Description of the idea: Concerns related to AI and social media underscore the need to make recommendation algorithms more transparent to foster critical thinking. Worries arise regarding the use of AI to manipulate public opinions, emphasizing the importance of one or more regulations. Contradictions in online freedom of expression are addressed, highlighting the influence of populations through Big Data, such as Elon Musk's acquisition of Twitter. Lastly, the moral commitment of online citizens is discussed, emphasizing the challenges related to freedom of expression and individual responsibility in the context of social networks and information at large.

In tension with:

- **Salient idea: Social network improve freedom expression.**

Corresponding extracts

1. « Changer la façon dont marche les algorithmes de recommandation ou au moins les rendre moins opaques serait une bonne option pour développer l'esprit critique et limiter l'enfermement dans une idée, mais ce n'est pas forcément le but de la plupart des réseaux sociaux. »

2. « Il y a des préoccupations concernant l'utilisation de l'IA et des neurosciences pour manipuler les opinions publiques et influencer les élections. Il est donc important de mettre en place des réglementations pour garantir l'utilisation. »
3. « Les mêmes qui défendent leur liberté d'expression mais qui censurent celle des autres. Twitter sous l'influence de la maison blanche? Complotiste jusqu'à preuve du contraire? Preuve qui a été apporté. Mais bon bienheureux les ignorants. Et ce sont ces ignorants qui vont insuffler ce "sens commun" ou "connaissances" à ces IA. Les pauvres entre le constat et la propagande la suite de 1 et de 0 pourrait avoir la peau des IA. »
4. « Avec le rachat de Twitter, Elon Musk a permis la libéralisation d'une parole trop souvent muselé aux profits de certains. »
5. « Si un citoyen partage son opinion sur les réseaux sociaux ou sur internet plus généralement, il s'engage moralement à ce que son argument soit partagé et commenté à son auditoire. »

Reflection on the use of algorithms emphasizes that it's the human application compromising our critical sense, rather than the algorithms themselves (4 extracts)

Description of the idea: Reflection on the use of algorithms emphasizes that it's the human application compromising our critical sense, rather than the algorithms themselves. Despite negative criticisms, social media algorithms still cater to the human need for affirmation in existing ideas, although divergent views remain enriching. It seems desirable for algorithms to broaden perspectives to avoid confinement in thought patterns. However, the evolution imposed by new AIs appears, for some, undemocratic as it doesn't offer enough diverse viewpoints.

In tension with:

- Salient idea: Fostering self and other-understanding thanks to NS and AI

Corresponding extracts

1. « C'est l'utilisation que nous, humains, faisons des algorithmes qui met en péril notre sens critique qui est quelques choses de vital dans une démocratie que les algos en elles mêmes. »
2. « Les algorithmes des réseaux sociaux ont depuis une dizaine d'années remis en cause faute de leur effet bulle mais à y voir de près ces derniers donne à l'homme ce que ce dernier a toujours voulu, c'est à dire être réconforté dans ces idées et ça c'est une chose que les algorithmes savent bien faire. »
3. « Le principe d'énaction qui consiste à ne pas dissocier action et perception explique bien comment se construit la cognition "en action". Si l'IA ne permet pas de "réfléchir" alors elle ne peut pas être considérée comme bénéfique pour l'humain. C'est ainsi que je reformulerai la question posée pour débattre. Si quelqu'un est d'accord ou pas d'accord, ça devient très intéressant d'échanger les raisons pour lesquelles on a un avis concordant ou discordant. »
4. « En modifiant les algorithmes, les recommandations pourraient potentiellement être différentes et ne pas nous enfermer dans des schémas de pensée. »

The challenges and dilemmas surrounding the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in social media moderation are perceived as significant issues (5 extracts)

Description of the idea: The challenges and dilemmas surrounding the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in social media moderation are perceived as significant issues. While some find it difficult to do without AI, others caution against the risks of errors and potential abuses. Fundamental questions about truth, democracy, and the legitimacy of moderation arise, emphasizing the incredible complexity of regulating AI with AI. Can we truly do without human moderation? Additionally, disparities in acquiring AI literacy and algorithmic awareness highlight the need for accessible education as early as possible. Finally, voices question the effectiveness of citizen consultations in collectively pondering solutions, sometimes favoring trust in researchers for crucial decisions.

Corresponding extracts

1. « Quand on voit les témoignages de certaines personnes ayant fait ce travail pour Facebook, il me paraît difficile de se passer de l'IA pour ce qui est de la modération. »
2. « Si on laisse la modération aux humains, en considérant qu'il reste objectif dans la mesure du possible, il y aura probablement moins d'erreur de jugement qu'avec une IA, mais est-il vraiment souhaitable d'exposer des humains à toutes les dérives présentes sur les réseaux sociaux, et ceux dans un travail à plein temps aux vues de la quantité de poste fait. »
3. « Qui peut prétendre avoir la vérité et se prévaloir d'avoir le droit de modérer? »
4. « Étant donné que l'IA ne possède pas de sens commun et n'a pas la connaissance du contexte, elle conduit parfois à supprimer des commentaires injustement alors que d'autres qui devraient être supprimés ne le sont pas. Ne faut-il pas laisser la modération aux humains ? »
5. « Le développement de l'IA ne permet pas toujours de résoudre les problèmes humains. Par exemple, sur les réseaux sociaux, l'IA (lorsqu'elle est utilisée) ne permet pas de modérer correctement les commentaires. »

There is concern about the risk of targeting and oppression by authoritarian regimes through algorithms (5 extracts)

Description of the idea: There is concern about the risk of targeting and oppression by authoritarian regimes through algorithms, as well as the potential to create deep disparities within societies. These concerns revolve around the establishment of a divide between those who can access these technologies and those who cannot, leading to social inequalities and involving the concept of social justice.

Corresponding extracts

1. « Il permet également à ces régimes de cibler des individus ou des groupes particuliers dans la société pour la persécution et l'oppression. »
2. « Ces technologies créeraient un fossé encore plus profond qu'il ne l'est déjà aujourd'hui et la vie humaine serait divisée en deux : ceux avec et ceux sans. Ceux qui peuvent et ceux qui ne peuvent pas. »
3. « Les avancées technoscientifiques telles que les modifications de l'intelligence humaine par des IA ne seraient alors réservées qu'à une infime partie de la société. Les chances pour un individu seraient encore plus biaisées. Ces technologies créeraient un fossé encore plus profond qu'il ne l'est déjà aujourd'hui et

la vie humaine serait divisé en deux : ceux avec et ceux sans. Ceux qui peuvent et ceux qui ne peuvent pas. »

4. « Mais du coup le risque c'est que si on a ce développement qui permet de créer des disparités fortes instantanément entre les gens rien qu'en rentrant dans un bâtiment et en sortant avec un bras bionique beaucoup plus fort, on risque de reproduire un schéma comme ça où on aura des gens qui auront un ascendant sur d'autres.
5. « Je pense que ça peut creuser d'avantage les inégalités sociales. »

Participants express worries about the prospect of being able to create a duplicate or an improved version of themselves (3 extracts)

Description of the idea: Participants express worries about the prospect of being able to create a duplicate or an improved version of themselves, questioning their personal identity and raising ethical concerns about the need to become optimized humans. These reflections highlight the conflict between technological enhancement and the preservation of personal identity.

Corresponding extracts

1. « Je pense que je ne supporterai pas d'avoir un double qui fait tout. Je pense que j'aurais toujours cette espèce de méfiance. Comme moi, à titre personnel, je ne supporterai pas d'avoir quelque chose, ou là, presque un humain, qui fait tout exactement comme moi, les mêmes choses et tout, j'aurais l'impression que ça veut prendre ma place. Alors que l'idée c'est juste de multiplier. »
2. Je pense que c'est des questions d'ordre éthique avant tout. Se dire que si toute l'humanité prend ce virage, on devient un humain optimisé... Savoir qu'aujourd'hui, on peut créer un membre chez des personnes qui ont perdu un membre, qui sont plus forts que des membres normaux. Pourquoi garder un bras normal s'il marche moins bien qu'un bras robotique ? Il y a des gens qui vont se poser des questions. »
3. Mon cerveau c'est moi donc si je mets des implants dans le cerveau, est-ce que je suis toujours moi ? Est-ce qu'être une version améliorée de moi-même c'est mieux qu'être moi et de travailler avec mes propres forces pour essayer de devenir quelqu'un de meilleur ? »

The complexity of privacy in the digital age is a crucial issue (5 extracts)

Description of the idea: The complexity of privacy in the digital age is a crucial issue. Some argue that privacy persists even as "personal data" circulates opaquely, but its interpretation varies among individuals, while others believe that future legislation should restrict online anonymity. Preserving the distinction between private and public life is emphasized by all as imperative for democracy and individual freedom. Some suggest that limiting the analysis of AI to publicly shared arguments could strengthen this ethical distinction. Finally, questions arise about the sociological evolution of privacy, suggesting a possible fading of this need if future generations deem it less essential.

In tension with:

- Salient idea: a new definition of private life is possible with a potential new generation

Corresponding extracts

1. « Je pense plutôt que l'on a une vie publique étendue aujourd'hui, ce qui ne veut pas dire que l'on a plus de vie privée ou que celle-ci est restreinte. Peut-être que des personnes s'en fichent de publier des photos d'eux sur internet, mais ils n'aimeraient pas que leur bilan comptable soit publié, donc la vie privée reste présente mais elle ne s'entend pas de la même manière pour chacun. »
2. « Tout dépend de la législation future. Peut-être on va nous imposer de ne plus être anonyme sur internet et de faire un lien avec notre identité de "vie réelle". Aujourd'hui elle a plus tendance à s'opposer à la notion de citoyen. »
3. « En effet, il est important de garder cette distinction. Le mélange de vie privé et vie publique n'est jamais bon. Ce concept est important pour le fondement de la démocratie, cela permet également de garantir une certaine liberté. »
4. « Pour que cette distinction (privé/public) soit bien distincte, il faudrait limiter le périmètre de d'analyse des IA et autres machines à des arguments partagés publiquement. »
5. « On pourrait peut-être arriver dans une société où ce besoin de respect de l'intimité disparaît sociologiquement, les nouvelles subjectivités, les nouveaux sujets qui vont nous remplacer n'auront plus ce besoin. Donc est-ce que c'est juste une question de génération ? »

Desirable / Undesirable

Desirable: Transparency of recommendation algorithms (2 extracts)

Description of the idea: The opacity of recommendation algorithms is a major difficulty in the exercise of democracy, especially on social networks. What's more, for some participants, it seems desirable that these algorithms propose new ideas to users, on the one hand, to encourage critical judgment, and on the other, to promote open-mindedness. That said, if algorithms were to operate in this way, it's likely that citizens would turn away from them, preferring, perhaps, to be confirmed in their assumptions ("cognitive bubble").

In tension with:

- Salient idea: Social network's objectives are maybe in opposition with the transparency.
- Salient idea: Users search to confirm their owns ideas.

Corresponding extracts

1. Changer la façon dont marche les algorithmes de recommandation ou au moins les rendre moins opaque serait une bonne option pour développer l'esprit critique et limité l'enfermement dans une idée, mais se n'est pas forcément le but de la plupart des réseaux sociaux
2. Ça peut avoir aussi l'effet inverse de modifier les algorithmes pour qu'ils nous montrent plus de pluralité, car la personne peut se désintéresser, je ne pense pas que cela sera efficace, ça fera fuir

Desirable: Algorithms remain tools (1 extract)

Description of the idea: Algorithms remain tools. If they work well in what participants expect of them, they remain instruments devoid of will or consciousness. It is therefore preferable to consider them primarily in terms of their instrumentality.

Corresponding extracts

1. L'intelligence artificielle reste un outil pour l'homme et n'a pas de volonté ou intérêt distincts de celui qui la possède ou la crée. Il semble donc que l'IA ne puisse pas posséder de personnalité juridique propre.

Desirable: Some participants also questioned the maintenance of what they consider to be an important boundary between the private and public spheres (2 extracts)

Description of the idea: Some participants also questioned the maintenance of what they consider to be an important boundary between the private and public spheres. This point is a corollary to the one relating to the opacity of algorithms. As long as this opacity lasts, it is desirable that this distinction be preserved as strongly as possible in the interests of privacy. This is why the real issue with AIs is less the AIs themselves than the purposes for which they are developed. Everyone needs to know what they are being used for. The regulation is absolutely necessary.

Corresponding extracts

1. Pour que cette distinction (privé/public) soit bien distincte, il faudrait limiter le périmètre de d'analyse des IA et autres machines à des arguments partagés publiquement.
2. « Je pense que dans l'idée c'est une opportunité car c'est absolument génial, l'humain est incroyable de réussir à créer ça ; mais encore une fois le problème, comme tout, le problème ce n'est pas l'outil, c'est comment on fait

Undesirable: The recognition of a legal personality for AIs is not desirable (2 extract)

Description of the idea: Following on from what some participants have said, others consider that the recognition of a legal personality for AIs, or even the recognition of the status of "subject of rights", is not desirable. At the same time, and also in line with other comments, it is not desirable to expect a virtuous attitude towards the responsible use of algorithms, as human beings remain fallible living beings.

Corresponding extracts

1. L'IA n'a pas de conscience, elle ne pourrait donc en aucun cas être considérée comme "sujet de droits" même d'un point de vue éthique elle ne peut atteindre un niveau de conscience suffisant pour être considérée comme des entités autonomes.
2. On a eu de l'esclavage, on a eu la deuxième guerre mondiale avec la shoah, on a eu des abominations comme ça et systématiquement ça se répète, systématiquement on n'apprend pas de nos erreurs. Encore aujourd'hui il y a du racisme, il y a des radicaux, on cherche toujours à se comparer aux autres et c'est très humain de faire ça).

Part 2 : Salient ideas of 2024

Als are for services to humans (5 extracts)

Description of the idea: The participants emphasized the powerful dimension of AI and, at the same time, the limits of the tool. Created by humans, they reproduce human biases, which calls into question the objectivity of analyses and their ethical value. These limits in the processing of "big data", which largely fall within the realm of probability, have an impact on security and justice, notably through the lack of transparency of algorithmic reasoning. However, this does not disqualify the real benefits, especially when it comes to carrying out difficult, even dangerous or simply repetitive tasks. In the latter respect, "intelligent" robots are seen as tools for improving safety, efficiency and productivity. But not all human problems can be solved by them, as human relationships, for example, are complex in a way that AIs cannot yet address. In addition to these limitations, there are concerns about the use of personal data, with participants worried about the risk of uncontrolled profiling and misuse, which the principle of consent would not satisfactorily resolve. The difficulties are much broader: social justice, meritocracy, inequality.

Corresponding extracts (click on the arrow on the left to unfold/fold)

- « I think that AI can be a good tool. We have already seen concerts of large concentrations where people gather, where there are concentrations of crowds (...) inevitably, there are crowd movements. And so, if we can manage this on a large scale (...) maybe they had several passages to get to a place, and by managing the flow of people, we can effectively avoid this kind of accident. »
- "I just have a problem with saying that AIs are objective. It is not especially true. They are subject to human bias. For instance, ChatGPT has political opinions, that is a fact. And, for me, this leads to the open-source debate, so that everyone can make their own model. But to say that AIs are objective is not true. What the developer thinks will strongly impact the AI in relation to the information it has been given."
- « AI cannot solve all human problems, its function remains limited when it comes to human feeling »
- « However, robots will remain 'slaves' to humans, as they will always be controlled by humans, both in the choice of tasks and in their upkeep and maintenance.
- "If we can analyze behavior, we can determine a lot about you (...) It is something that worries me, but I recognize that (...) it can bring a lot of benefits (...) from a security point of view."

Ethical challenge for AIs: risks, inequality and human nature (5 extracts)

Description of the idea: Participants point out that the limits and risks of AIs call into question their role in future society. Many believe that AI does not need emotions or a consciousness similar to that of humans, as its capabilities are strictly functional. However, the existence of biases in Big Data raises a problem of objectivity: AIs could also reinforce social inequalities. What's more, its access remains limited to certain populations, while its potential for surveillance and control, through facial recognition, questions our understanding of democracy and individual freedom. Moreover, some participants fear that AIs could be used for political ends, or even promote authoritarian regimes. In this context, the idea of giving rights to AIs is problematic: it could lead to ethical conflicts about fairness and justice. Finally, if AIs become increasingly autonomous and capable of surpassing human

beings in certain fields, the nature of humanity is also at stake, with the fear that “intelligent” machines will replace humans.

In tension with:

- Salient idea: On the one hand, risk of uncontrollable AI (threat to freedoms, equality, democracy), and the conviction that AI must remain a controlled extension of human intelligence, without any claim to rights or moral status on the other.
- Undesirable: AIs with emotional ability.

Corresponding extracts (click on the arrow on the left to unfold/fold)

- « AIs do not need to have emotions, and I think, if we really question the fact of an AI with emotions, with a soul, with rights, I think we will tend towards the creation of a life form and before we get to that, the world disappears, because it challenges religion, beliefs and everything collapses. »
- “I just have a problem with saying that AIs are objective. It's not especially true. They are subject to human bias. For example, ChatGPT has political opinions, that's a fact. And, for me, this leads to the open source debate, so that everyone can make their own model. But to say that AIs are objective is not true. What the developer thinks will strongly impact the AI in relation to the information it has been given.”
- The problem is that from one day to the next, the state can go in the complete opposite direction from what it was (...) If tomorrow, the French government - we're a democracy, all that - sets up an AI system with information, people will say “it's okay, the government's cool, we can do what we want”... But if tomorrow the government goes totally totalitarian, it has the possibility of tracing every person who is against this government, who acts against it. As a result, we could see completely despicable repression, as we've seen in China (...)
- Not everyone will be able to take advantage of these advances, for reasons of cost and knowledge, but there is also an inequality of opportunity when it comes to AI, with a large proportion of the world's population having little or no access to the Internet and therefore to AI tools to improve their capabilities
- The reality is that what makes us human and humane will not change. We're not in a Terminator-style dystopia where AIs end up taking over the world and suddenly gain consciousness.

Personal data: between commercial exploitation, surveillance and necessary regulation (5 extracts)

Description of the idea: Participants highlight their concerns around the collection and exploitation of personal data, often in the context of targeted advertising and surveillance using technologies such as AI and facial recognition. They highlight the danger these practices represent for privacy, individuals' control over their information, and the potential threat to freedom and democracy, notably through the centralization of data and its use for commercial purposes or government surveillance. There are, however, voices in favor of appropriate regulation, arguing that public or available data does not necessarily undermine the distinction between private and public life, provided it is used transparently and within ethical limits.

Corresponding extracts (click on the arrow on the left to unfold/fold)

- “They sell them to big companies to get very, very targeted information. And that raises the question of whether we'll become a product in the future.”

- "I think the main purpose of AIs is not safety, but it's really for the purpose of selling data for targeted advertising instead."
- "I do not want any government or entity to know where I have been, when I have been there, why I have been there, and sell it to people I do not know. Because this information belongs to me, because I do not want anyone, I do not know to know what I have done because it could harm me sooner or later, and because it actually belongs to me as information. I feel that my freedom and my rights are being infringed, and that you have to find a balance between the right that is being « taken » from you and what it can bring you in the future."
- "As you can see, in general, democracies are increasingly in danger. There are always more and more laws on the security loop. Is not AI and facial recognition something that is going to bring us closer to that, but even faster?"
- « Personally, I think that using publicly available data to perform behavioral analysis using Artificial Intelligence does not necessarily break the principle of private and public, given that these analyses could also be performed by a human being specialized in the field, and that the data is left free for everyone to access".

Between freedom and security: the challenges of data collection and AI in a digital world (4 extracts)

Description of the idea: Participants discussed the exploitation of personal data and the fundamental questions this raises about individual freedom, confidentiality and the risks associated with the use of new technologies. They express unease at the idea of becoming "products" or resources for companies who, often without transparency, exploit their data for targeted advertising purposes, sometimes with unforeseen consequences for privacy. The lack of control worries them, especially as this data can be used to influence behaviour, as illustrated by the Cambridge Analytica scandal. Although some are willing to give up their information to benefit from free services or increased security, they all insist on the need for the right balance to avoid any form of abuse. The question of whether or not we allow these technologies to shape our lives remains open, with a growing need for transparency and regulation to avoid abuses.

In tension with:

- Salient idea: The effectiveness of technology and AI is key to offering personalized services.

Corresponding extracts (click on the arrow on the left to unfold/fold)

- "I think the main purpose of AI is not security, but it is really about selling data for targeted advertising instead."
- "Just because Google or Netflix already knows what you are watching does not mean you should be okay with giving them more information about you. Because you do not know who it is going to end up with. You have no idea who is going to use this information to do what" (...) (FR-d, private data, e-marketing)
- "I do not want anyone to tell me what I am going to like. I want to find out what I am going to like."
- "If you buy a ticket for cinema, you understand a little more what this data is going to be used for, whereas with AI, we do not know at all..."

Artificial intelligence: between ethical limits, rights and human control (5 extracts).

Description of the idea: Debates around AI rights are marked by divergent opinions, between those who believe that an AI, in the absence of consciousness and emotions, cannot be considered a subject of law, and those who question the implications of an AI surpassing human intelligence. Some argue that achieving emotional AI would overturn the foundations of society and religion, while others point out that AI, while efficient and useful, remains a mere machine, incapable of claiming rights. On the other hand, other concerns emerge, including biases in current AIs, the risk of replacing humans in certain functions, and the question of liability in the event of a machine's wrongful action. Finally, although robots can improve efficiency and safety by taking on tedious tasks, it is widely accepted that they must remain under human control and never acquire complete autonomy.

In tension with:

- Salient idea: AIs could one day surpass human intelligence.
- Undesirable: AIs as subjects of law.

Corresponding extracts (click on the arrow on the left to unfold/fold)

- "It is inconceivable to me that any technology could eventually 'claim' rights".
- "A person, an animal, a company have physical attributes, shared or not, but perceptible. AIs, on the other hand, is just the opposite. To date, it has no freedom of thought".
- "If AIs can, in time, surpass humans, how can they not have rights superior to human rights?"
- "I think at this point, AIs do not tend to have emotions, because they not need to".
- "Robots will remain 'slaves' to humans, as they will always be controlled by humans, both in the choice of tasks and in their upkeep and maintenance."

Dual use of technology: Benefits and dangers for freedom and privacy (3 extracts)

Description of the idea: Participants highlight the risks and benefits of modern technologies, including AI and the collection of personal data. While these tools can offer benefits in terms of security or personalized services, they also carry dangers in terms of surveillance, social control and manipulation. The main concern lies in the misuse of these technologies, particularly by authoritarian governments or private companies, which could exploit personal data for political or commercial purposes, thereby curtailing individual freedoms. The idea of becoming a "product" or being constantly monitored raises ethical questions about the ownership of our data and the protection of our privacy, reminding us that it is crucial to strike a balance between the benefits of these technologies and the preservation of our fundamental rights.

In tension with:

- Salient idea: Some citizens passively accept these technologies.

Corresponding extracts (click on the arrow on the left to unfold/fold)

- “The problem is that from one day to the next, the state can go in the complete opposite direction from what it was (...) If tomorrow, the French government – we are a democracy, all that – sets up an AI system with information, people will say ‘It is okay, the government’s cool, we can do what we want’... But if tomorrow’s government adopts a totally totalitarian policy, it has the possibility of trancing every person who is against this government, who acts against it. As a result, we could see completely despicable repression, as we have seen in China (...)”
- “It is true that it has a huge range of possibilities, and it is super interesting and super important, but it is a tool and everything depends on how it is used.”
- “If we can analyse behavior, we can determine a lot about you (...) It is something that worries me, but I recognise that (...) it can bring a lot of benefits (...) from a security of view.”

Compromises for AI's benefits (4 extracts)

Description of the idea: Participants highlighted the benefits and risks associated with artificial intelligence (AI) in our daily interactions. AI is seen as a valuable aid in supporting human actions, notably by limiting the potential errors associated with human fallibility. Recognized as being more objective than humans, AI appears to be better able to process large quantities of data and make impartial decisions. This is particularly true of crowd management at events. Behind these benefits, however, lies the reality that AI is simultaneously transforming human actions, for example, in transport thanks to GPS, and weakening the ability to orientate oneself autonomously. There is also the difficulty of exploiting personal data. So, the benefits of AI often call for compromises.

In tension with:

- **Salient idea: Compromises have to be made to reap the benefits of AI.**

Corresponding extracts (click on the arrow on the left to unfold/fold)

- “It is not as easy to communicate with a machine when you are human and vice versa. But there is no doubt that it can also avoid a lot of things, by this automated and multi-presence side, in the sense that you are really in complete vigilance, and that there are fewer errors that you could have than being human.”
- “Eventually, AIs are supposed to be more objective than we are. And, from the moment we are aware of what they are capable of doing with data, it is going to bring more positive exteriority than negative”
- “The human being is transforming and, by creating new tools, it removes certain needs – for example, looking for the right road – but, of course, it creates new needs and constraints”
- “Honestly, I think the problem is not so much that we are starting to do this now, but more that we need to look at what we are allowing them to do in the long term, because we know that we are living in an era where information is gold. If services like Facebook are free, it is because they use your data to influence politics, for example, with the Cambridge Analytica problem. And I think that... If we take the example of China, it does help to reduce the crime rate, but there is a fine line to be drawn between what you are willing to give of your personal information and what you can gain, so the level of security you can actually guarantee yourself, thanks to this.”

Individual liberty and democracy (5 extracts)

Description of the idea: Artificial intelligence, and facial recognition in particular, raises concerns about the exercise of individual freedoms in democracies. Indeed, participants wonder whether this type of technology might not ultimately lead to the emergence of a form of control over citizens, by tracking their actions and making targeted use of their personal data. Thus, freedom of expression could be constrained by AI, through the fear it provokes, but also by enclosing citizens in information bubbles that reinforce their beliefs by eliminating from the outset different, well-argued positions. In addition, the issue of unequal access to so-called "intelligent" technologies, and the complexity sometimes involved in their use, adds to the distance between certain categories of citizens. For this reason, participants felt that critical judgment of these technologies should be reinforced and encouraged.

In tension with:

- **Salient idea:** The risk of an authoritarian and totalitarian drift thanks to the use of surveillance technologies.
- **Undesirable:** Manipulation of information and reduction of diversity of opinion.

Corresponding extracts (click on the arrow on the left to unfold/fold)

- "As you can see, in general, democracies are increasingly in danger. There are always more and more laws on the security loop. Is not AI and facial recognition something that is going to bring us closer to that, but even faster".
- Donc So if we mix that with AI and the ability to track every single person, would not we be looking at a future where a totalitarian government is going to be set up and there is no turning back, just this government that is going to go on for years and years?
- "Imagine, we install this whole idea of AI and facial recognition all over the country, sometime in the future. (...) We know every crowd movement, we know every person's daily life, can we still sell ourselves as a country with freedom? When you are born, you are not going to ask a child if it agrees with all that."
- "Social network interfaces often create information bubbles by presenting content specific to each user's profile. This can lock people into closed circles of ideas, reinforcing their convictions, but on the other hand, can be dangerous by encouraging the formation of assemblies"
- "Maybe it's going to be used for a political campaign we don't agree with (...). Or maybe our data will be used to make another entity do something we don't want done"

For a real informed consent (4 extracts)

Description of the idea: Here, participants further explore their concerns around the use of personal data and AI, particularly in terms of privacy, consent and power. Some fear that the collection and analysis of data, even public data, could lead to totalitarian control using these kinds of technologies, such as facial recognition and geolocation, to curtail individual freedom. Others point out that, while there are benefits, such as security or crime reduction, the use of such data requires a difficult balance between what individuals agree to share and the benefits they derive from it. At stake is the absence of genuine informed consent, the manipulation of private data to influence policy or social behavior, and the blurring of the boundary between public and private data.

In tension with:

- Salient idea: A difficult balance between the security offered by data use and the violation of privacy.
- Undesirable: decrease of individual freedom.

Corresponding extracts (click on the arrow on the left to unfold/fold)

- “So if we mix that with AI and the ability to track every single person, wouldn't we be looking at a future where a totalitarian government is going to be set up and there's no turning back, just this government that's going to go on for years and years?”
- “Does that mean we're going to sign papers saying “OK, I agree to have my image analyzed, taken, etc.”? It's not just about analyzing your image, it's also about saying “OK, we'll recognize that from any angle a camera takes, I'll know that it's [first name], so for example, me. It's also something very private and something you don't necessarily agree with. Of course it can have positive effects, but even the second they choose to take that data, do you agree?”
- “Honestly, I think the problem isn't so much that we're starting to do this now, but more that we need to look at what we're allowing them to do in the long term, because we know that we're living in an era where information is gold. If services like Facebook are free, it's because they use your data to influence politics, for example, with the Cambridge Analytica problem. And I think that... If we take the example of China, for example, it helps to reduce the crime rate, but there's a fine line to be drawn between what you're willing to give of your personal information and what you can gain, so the level of security you can actually guarantee yourself, thanks to this.”
- “Personally, I think that using publicly available data to perform behavioral analysis using Artificial Intelligence doesn't necessarily break the principle of private and public, given that these analyses could also be performed by a human being specialized in the field, and that the data is left free for everyone to access »

Responsibility: a difficult frontier (4 extracts)

Description of the idea: Participants discuss the legal and ethical challenges surrounding the liability of AI systems and robots, highlighting the lack of clear legislation and the risks associated with this lack of regulation. Currently, liability is attributed to the owner or user of the robot, but there are exceptions, notably when the damage is caused by a design or manufacturing defect, creating a real blur on the exact contours of liability. Although regulatory proposals, such as that of the European Commission, seek to define clear

responsibilities, potential abuses in the absence of well-established laws are a cause for concern. What's more, the need to raise citizens' awareness of the use of their data and the complexity of digital issues appears to be a priority in order to avoid human error and guarantee security in the use of technologies.

In tension with:

- Salient idea: The importance of making individuals aware of how to manage their personal data and the complexity of digital issues.

Corresponding extracts (click on the arrow on the left to unfold/fold)

- [“Legally, it is neither a natural nor a legal person, so whose responsibility is it?”](#)
- [“The European Commission has proposed a regulation on artificial intelligence, which lays down rules on the liability of AI systems. This regulation, which has not yet come into force, stipulates that responsibility for the actions of an AI system lies with the system's constructor, who is the person or entity that controls the system and is responsible for its use.”](#)
- [“There are exceptions to this principle. For example, liability for the actions of a robot may lie with the designer or constructor of the robot, if the damage is due to a defect in the design or manufacture of the robot”](#)
- [“The EU's Digital Service Act establishes the principle that what's illegal offline is also illegal online. This would seem to be a good basis for preventing abuses of citizenship. A basis whose sufficiency needs to be questioned in detail.”](#)

AI's and moral frontier of humanity (3 extracts)

Description of the idea: Participants express a tension between the growing complexity of artificial intelligences and the perceived limits of their nature compared to the fundamental characteristics of humanity. The clear distinction between human and machine is often emphasized, with AI depicted as incapable of replicating essential human qualities such as emotion, consciousness, or free will. While some perspectives reject the idea of attributing essence or rights to AI, others highlight potential societal and moral dangers, such as the questioning of fundamental beliefs or the reinforcement of algorithmic biases, which can hinder neutrality and open-mindedness. These reflections reveal a concern about hybridization perceived as a threat to moral and social order, while reaffirming the uniqueness and stability of human values in the face of technological evolution.

In tension with:

- Salient idea: The frontier between the biological being and the machine is so clear.

Corresponding extracts (click on the arrow on the left to unfold/fold)

- [“Wanting to produce an AI that perfectly resembles us\] “it's impossible and \(...\) it would call into question far too many things that are the fundamentals of what our worldview is.”](#)
- [“A person, an animal, a company have physical attributes, shared or not, but perceptible. AI, on the other hand, is just the opposite. To date, it has no freedom of thought.”](#)

- ["I don't really see it as a problem because the barrier between the biological being and the machine is so clear that I don't really see the point of even considering that the machine has essence, it's just going to cause us problems, we're going to have to create laws and everything. »](#)

Desirable / Undesirable

Desirable: AI: between the challenges of interaction and the promise of innovation. (3 extracts)

Description of the idea: Participants highlighted the practical benefits of artificial intelligence and robotics, seen as valuable tools for optimizing human tasks. Although communication between humans and machines remains complex, the automation and heightened vigilance offered by AI can reduce errors and improve safety, particularly in high-risk contexts such as crowd management. On the other hand, while new technological tools meet certain needs by simplifying human activities, they also generate new constraints. Finally, the use of robots for heavy-duty tasks is seen as a positive step towards greater efficiency, safety and productivity in various sectors.

In tension with:

- Salient idea: AI is seen as a powerful and desirable tool, capable of reducing human error, meeting new needs, and providing practical solutions, such as in crowd flow management or simplifying previously burdensome tasks.

Corresponding extracts (click on the arrow on the left to unfold/fold)

- "It is not as easy to communicate with a machine when you're human and vice versa. But there is no doubt that it can also avoid a lot of things, by this automated and multi-presence side, in the sense that you are really in complete vigilance, and there are fewer errors than being human."
- "The human being is transforming and, by creating new tools, it removes certain needs - for example, looking for the right road - but, of course, it creates new needs and constraints"
- "I think it [AI] can be a good tool. We've already seen concerts or large concentrations where people gather, where there are concentrations of crowds (...) inevitably, there are crowd movements. And so, if we can manage this on a large scale (...) maybe they had several passages to get to a place, and by managing the flow of people, we can effectively avoid this kind of accident."

Desirable: Need for regulation, education and critical awareness (3 extracts)

Description of the idea: In the face of technological change, it is becoming essential to develop a digital awareness, by questioning the use of data and making citizens more aware of the quality of information. Acquiring a global vision of subjects enables us to cultivate a critical mind, analyze different points of view and form informed opinions. However, this progress

requires an appropriate regulatory framework, as a lack of legislation persists, leaving areas of uncertainty regarding the framework of these technologies and their impact.

In tension with:

- Salient idea: The importance of an appropriate legislative framework to regulate technological uses, fill legal gaps and ensure adequate protection in the face of digital challenges.

Corresponding extracts (click on the arrow on the left to unfold/fold)

- “I think that as we evolve technologically, we need to evolve our digital awareness, to know what we're doing with our data, to ask ourselves questions - about which site we're going to and about all kinds of things that people, the majority of people, don't know about, and where IT makes us aware of them.”
- “It's taking the whole picture into account that enables us to think critically and make informed judgements. Indeed, when we have a global vision of a subject, we are able to identify different points of view, arguments and counter-arguments. This enables us to form our own opinion in an objective and considered way.”
- “Lack of legislation at present”

Undesirable: The risks of surveillance and loss of personal freedom (3 extract)

Description of the idea: Participants highlight major concerns about the impact of AI, facial recognition and the exploitation of personal data. They underline the risks to freedom and privacy, with questions raised about the compatibility of these technologies with democratic values. Concern is also growing about the possibility of becoming a “product” in a commercial system where our data is used for profit, without informed consent. Finally, the opacity of algorithms and the potential manipulation of personal information reinforce fears of a future in which authoritarian regimes could grow stronger, threatening democratic principles.

Corresponding extracts (click on the arrow on the left to unfold/fold)

- “Imagine, we install this whole idea of AI and facial recognition all over the country, sometime in the future. (...) we know every crowd movement, we know every person's daily life, can we still sell ourselves as a country with freedom? When you're born, you're not going to ask an infant if it agrees with all that.”
- “They sell it (big data) to big companies to get very, very targeted information. This raises the question of whether we'll become a product in the future”
- “As you can see, in general, democracies are increasingly in danger. There are always more and more laws on the security loop. Isn't AI and facial recognition something that's going to bring us closer to that, but even faster?”

Undesirable: Ethical and Social Challenges of Artificial Intelligence: Fears, Inequalities and Questioning Fundamental Values (3 extracts)

Description of the idea: Participants highlighted several concerns about artificial intelligence. On the one hand, there is the fear that AI, by artificially reproducing life, could call into question religious and philosophical foundations, or even bring about the end of humanity before machines replace us. On the other hand, the question of the rights of machines is raised: it is deemed inconceivable that a technology can claim rights, due to its lack of fundamental human characteristics. Furthermore, AI is criticized for accentuating inequalities and reproducing existing social biases, being perceived as a system that has already gone astray. Finally, the negative impacts of AI on values such as meritocracy are also questioned, with doubt cast on the relevance of this value at a time when AI could call it into question.

Corresponding extracts (click on the arrow on the left to unfold/fold)

- “Imagine, we install this whole idea of AI and facial recognition all over the country, sometime in the future. (...) we know every crowd movement, we know every person's daily life, can we still sell ourselves as a country with freedom? When you're born, you're not going to ask an infant if it agrees with all that.”
- “They sell it (big data) to big companies to get very, very targeted information. This raises the question of whether we'll become a product in the future”
- “As you can see, in general, democracies are increasingly in danger. There are always more and more laws on the security loop. Isn't AI and facial recognition something that's going to bring us closer to that, but even faster?”