Global Scientific JOURNALS

Cultural Polarization: Trans-humanistic Curse

Dr. Muhammad Rizwan Junaid, Mrs. Khadija Naz

ABSTRACT

Transhumanism is sharply influencing every aspect of human life; especially the relationships across society. In this very context, the balance between organizations and society seems shattered. Trans-humanistic organizations are dictating a new code of conduct to society; a new culture is in making. This paper is an initial attempt to encircle the notion of organizational objectivity that impacts the subjective compendium of societal totality. Social norms, cultural values and human relations are at the brink of disconnection and rejection. Every novel scientific invention is turning humans into robots and people are being swayed to be more mechanistic than socialistic. It drives further towards alienation, dejection, loneliness and isolation. The conceptual and analytical paradigm of this paper strives to explore the imbalance in this relationship and invites management experts to contribute further to strengthen this intellectual movement against onslaught of technology.

Key Words: Transhumanism, organization, society, values, norms, objectivity, subjectivity, culture.

Introduction

Transhumanism concentrates upon radical alteration of human nature by adopting and introducing latest technologies (Mercer, 2014) and further by extending human-technology interfaces. Transhumanists establish their thesis on the assumption that with the help of novel technologies they can bring betterment in humans' psychological, physiological and cognitive development; aging, illness, misery and other human impediments can be addressed through ultra-intelligent technologies (Carvalko, 2012). In addition to it, they propose that human beings can be transformed into highly intelligent organic species by biological uplifting while passing through evolutionary process that brings cognitive enhancement and transforms human into *post human* (Ferrando, 2014). This core philosophy of transhumanism revolves around accelerating natural human progression by interfering in natural process of personal growth through technological acceleration.

Extensive use of technology in commercial and non-commercial organization has its justified rationale and it has further turned out as a reality that streamlines organizational functions and operations. Rapid technological automation has lifted human efficiency to its peak; a bank executive serves thousands of traders by a single click of key board, Insurance companies round the globe maintain high level of precision with the help of sophisticated technologies and in this very context every successful organization is trans-human (Mezick, 2012). It is not the use of technology that influences natural cultural order or behavioral compendium of humans working in these organizations but the *approach* that works behind this technological invasion. Transhumanists are firm in their argument that they are all willing and gear to transform existing human generations in *superhuman beings* by harnessing technological singularity with artificial intelligence (Nordhaus, 2007). Technology is not autonomous but dependent on humans who confirm its existence at the first place but later drown in its flow up to the extent that *self-determinism* transmutes into *technological determinism* (Lanier, 2013) since technological empowerment devices a new cultural bond that seems machine, gadgets, instruments and equipment surrounded a human more than other humans.

Humans are consolidate social being who pass their lives together with other humans; for their very existence, they form *social groups* and establish their identity with reference to these groups. These primary groups give way to the formalization of social organization in which human interact, trade, move along, produce and organize themselves and learn by being with nature. Organizations are in-organic totalities that learn from society and build their own systems in align with already established social norms, culture, values and organizations. The only difference that separates society from an organization is the notion of objectivity. Society develops *subjective relationships* while an organization goes for *objective connections.* Societies differ from one another and they evolve by the passage of time and it can be said that social circle is very complex and at the same time dynamic as well.

Social evolution has many facets, it is evident that scientific inventions and investigations have played pivotal role in shaping human behavior but at the same time the role of religion, literature,

philosophy, psychology and other related disciplines cannot be undermined as they also contributed ominously in developing a set pattern of human behavior and facilitate human in the process of understanding one self. Furthermore, these non-scientific disciplines study human behavior from a multi-dimensional viewpoint that incorporates cultural, ethical, political, economic and psychological perspectives. It concretes the foundation of diverse human behavior that guides organizations to frame their infrastructure according to these lines with respect to any specific social surroundings or environment.

Organizations grow and expand that bring change into human behavior at work while societies go through continuous *change* process that bring primary alterations in fundamental norms which impress human behavior. This behavioral modification and evolution can be detected easily while studying different generations in a society. The most important aspect that is to be kept under consideration while studying human behavior is social *evolution*. Change is not a radical phenomenon rather gradual but consistent one that slowly but steadily advances and brings prominent modification with high level of acceptance in human behavior. Since that, *change* is a metaphysical essence that is why its existence is more *subjective* in a social context, but the organizational narrative of change is objective. It is brought with a clear vision and well defined mission to gain profitable options in favor of an organization and human beings are meant to pass through this process if they wish to exist within the close proximity of an organization. Organization citizenship is in a paradox of personal identity; and working population within these organizations is carrying forward a *new culture*. Current day organizations are dictating a *productive and objective culture* to prevailing societies; by and large, societal institutions are in a fix to "take it or leave it" frame. This paper exemplifies this *metaphysical impressionism* that is shaking centuries old social norms by injecting a new cultural edge. Transhumanism is formalizing a sophisticated, scientific and objectively wrapped culture and their rising influence is leaving no room, for ordinary humans, that can shelter them against this blitzkrieg of scientific advancements.

Cultural Dialectics

There are countless definitions of 'culture', and in these definitions; we find some common denominators as *collective beliefs*, *values*, *experiences* and *attitudes*. It can be said that *culture* is the core and prime tag of any specific group of people (society) that not only provides this group a credible identity but also separates it from other social groups (Macionis, 2010). In addition to captioned common denominators; *philosophy, literature, architecture, language, aesthetics* and *politics* play crucial role in establishing collective impression of a social group. Historical progression of different cultures made it clear that cultural evolution revolves around the core influence generated by internal and external factors, as culture cannot evolve in isolation and it needs a concrete frame of reference for its progression and evolution. The notions of *civilized* and *uncivilized* culture seem in contrast with intrinsic comprehension of culture. The question is *how do we label a culture as civilized and another as uncivilized?* It solely depends upon the benchmarks we set to define *civilized;* the elites empower the poor quarters of any society and

they relate this conquering spree with *cultural supremacy*, western colonial powers termed themselves civilized and mark their colonial subjects as uncivilized. Herbert Spencer's theory of *social Darwinism* manifested the evolutionary progression of culture and termed it as a natural subject, he further made it clear that cultural progression gave way to self-improvement and every culture has its very own phenomenon of progression that is why cultures cannot be studied collectively (Spenser, 1852). The comprehensive process of socio-cultural evolution makes it clear that culture turns out to be more complex over time; every society re-generates its needs.

It is imperative to take into account that cultural evolution and human progression move together and the process of evolutionary change is all natural as it is not instigated by any artificial factor. Evolution is all natural since it aligns with changing environment that dictates new ways of doing thing. It is purely a *cognitive process* that advocates notion of change in an acceptable, adoptable and gradual fashion. Acceptability is the core factor that derives humans towards exploration with a clear understanding of what are they up to? with full *mind-body* relation and they move forward with a sense of achievement. It is not accelerated to an artificial pace, that does not leave any room for human nature to accept things as they appear, but all harmonious to the pace of natural advancement as nature is compatible with human instincts. Transhumanists pursue humans to build a better environment for themselves (Huxley, 1957) and establish clear directions for humans to become *super human*. In brief, transhumanism tried to institute a new concept of human evolution; as they believed in accelerating the natural process of evolution up to the extent that man can control his *state of being*. They are firm in pushing humans towards a new kind of existence, *a post human* who seems in well control of his surrounding conditions and actively participates in chores of life through an evolutionary process supported by technological inventions, interventions and innovations (Bainbridge, 2005).

The *dialectics of human evolution* or *dialectical humanism* (Das, 1993) clearly maintains a plausible balance between basic human needs and sociocultural configuration; the societal structure establishes the social character of human. Furthermore, it expands the notion of *utilitarianism* (Habibi, 2001) and benchmark all human physical and psychological actions/initiatives in the very right perspective of *concept of greater good* or *consequentialism* (justifying viability of every human action in the light of the good outcome or consequences) (Goodman, 2009). The multi-dimensional human evolution requires physical growth and mental upbringing (development) in relation with a well knitted social circle where *interdependence and dependence* are cores bonding factors and *individualistic* and *isolated* developmental growth is not credited. 'Man is a social animal' and it is all natural that he learns, lives and grows fast by being in a like-minded group. A sheer sense of independence is needed to gain personal strength but being independent must not be taken as a value added qualification rather a built-in personality feature. Trans-humanizing an individual through sophisticated technological interfaces is killing for *commune,* it accelerates the possibility of *digital connection* and *social isolation.*

It is evidently clear that technology is an *accelerated factor* that provides ample possibilities to humans to transform manual motions into an automated frame; furthermore, it opens new ways to overcome physical and mechanical barricades but the question that is very important to be answered is, *if technological upbringings help man to overcome his psychological and metaphysical conditions also?*. Every culture roots out of *essences* and these essences are behavioral in their very nature. Historical evidences tell us that nations round the globe passed through many phases and in each and every phase, they implant latest technologies of their times to get the job done but notion of *metaphysical existentialism* remains intact and it can never be altered through any technology. The abuse of technology has generated a sheer sense of *individualism* and damaged *collectivism*. Transhumanistic advancements are undertaken on the cost of relationships, human interactions, values, social norms, aesthetics and beliefs. We are marching towards a robotic culture with clear vision of independence and individual totality.

'Extropian Principles' (More, 1990) advocate the possibility of *intelligent technology* that can be a combination of science and technology to *transcend* the natural limits imposed by culture, environment and biology. It is so ambiguous to consider technology having any role to play when man want to transcends and wishes to move beyond. Transcendentalism believes in innate goodness of man and nature, it further advocates the ideology in real sense of words that *man at its best when self-reliant and self-determining on the basis of subjective intuitions by developing a concrete and pure insight in its very own nature* (Stevenson, 2012). The foremost foundations of transcendentalism were built by Immanuel Kant, when he presented *transcendental idealism* and primarily emphasized upon the power of *human self* that constructed knowledge out of sense perception and further developed universal frames (categories) for better comprehension. Kant manifested the power of *self-consciousness* that offers sufficient chances to an individual to travel par limits while using his/her intuitive abilities and strive to search for true knowledge that is far beyond than *mere empirical investigations* (Allias, 2003).

Culture is a subjective phenomenon (purely cognitive and symbolic) and its evolution depends upon the bond, relationships, closeness, mutual concern and inter-relatedness between two individuals (Stark, 2007). Cultural progression cannot be formalized as it is from within and every other culture is peculiar in its own proximity. Political, sociological, anthropological and environmental factors ranging different cultures share some commonalities and motivate diverse nations to accept and tolerate one another in order to make the world a better living place (William, 1983). Dialectic evolution of culture is purely a *phenomenological process* and it is difficult perhaps even improbable to recognize a culture as *primitive* in comparison with another culture that appears *modern*; socio-cultural environment of Nepal (a small country host Himalayan range) is all the way different from Australia and they should not be compared with one another. Human-technology interface is *need based* and temporal with a clear objective sense; but if it is thought, as transhumanists claim, that technology can interfere in natural processes then it is wrong as nature does not allow any interference and it goes in an unchanged cyclic fashion.

Theory of Culture and Theory of Change: A Harmonized relationship for cultural evolution

Culture in its closest context displays the way human construe their environment and biology and it can be closely considered as primary adaptive tool that relates human with their environment. Human adaptation of environment and undergoing changes is faster than the biological evolution; there is a similarity between human behavior and animal behavior, the only difference is that the intensity of animal behavior is *need driven and objective* while human behavior is *rationalized and subjective* (Ogburn, 1966). Since that, human behavior is more subjective then it is equally complex and varies from human to human even though all humans belong to same gene or class; on the contrary, animal behavior is uniform and simple and its intensity dependent upon physical power.

Theory of culture seems in plausible balance with theory of change that explains the process of change in relation with possible outcomes (short term, intermediate and long term); and produces an inter-dependent chain that exemplifies one outcome as pre-requisite for another one. It is a dialectical change process that gives way to every outcome to settle in its related social context while maintaining required balance between social and biological evolution (Clark, 2012). W. Brian Arthur in his famous manuscript *The Nature of Technology* considered technology as material culture and advocated the role of technology in cultural evolution by applying the concept of dialectical change on technological evolution, he detailed that technological evolution goes parallel with natural cultural evolution and every new technology provides ample space to another new technology and motivate humans to accept this technological interference in their process of natural evolution (Arthur, 2009).

In the light of what Brian said, *Can we consider technology as an integral element of any culture? or Is technology a parallel culture?* The relationship between technology and culture is intricate, complex and all enthralling as well but positioning technology in cultural context is itself a question worth answering. If we take technology as an integral cultural element then we cannot justify its presence as it does not seem dependent upon the culture for its existence rather the case is contrary as it is an accelerated element with clear objectivity quite capable to create new dimension for any culture (Feenberg, 2010). It is not from within but from outside that re-shapes existing cultural foundations and take everyone by storm to follow a novel track. Human acceptability of technology is *purely objective* as technology is meant to perform certain task blended with set pattern of procedure, process and timings with clear directions to evaluate the outcomes generated that advocate the possibility of quantifying *return on investments*. Culture is a *subjective* phenomenon and the prime argument to prove this point is that we cannot generalize the outcomes generated through the process of change in one culture with any other culture, on the other hand, the most important and core feature of technology is its generalizability as it acts uniformly (without any variation) in a standardized manner that further develops a notion of *trust* and this trust weakens the bond between two human when human interaction comes cross face with technology (Kiran, 2010). As discussed earlier that technology is an accelerated feature

with clear mission and objectivity, that is why, it cannot be undertaken as an evolutionary natural cultural factor.

Heidegger's post phenomenological perspective of Technology

Martin Heidegger's post phenomenological perspective of technology or simply his philosophy of technology focuses upon the *essence of technology* and by essence of technology he means to discuss *how the phenomenon of technology comes to existence?* His perspective regarding presence of technology clarifies his meaning of technology as he considers technology as two fold; (1) technology is a means to meet an end and (2) technology is a human activity (Heidegger, 1977). He identified a *free relationship* between human and technology and discussed it further as this free relationship provides ways to human to comprehend the essence of technology; as captioned earlier the core that frames, shapes and transforms technology in a workable fashion (Waddington, 2005). The essence that derives technology according to Heidegger is *instrumental* and being instrumental means that technology is *for something* and when it is for something then it cannot be subjective rather purely objective and it is the point where Heidegger contrasted theory of change.

Modern technology according to Heidegger has brought humans face to face with nature; and cultural symbolism has taken a new turn as human are undertaking nature as a resource that can be manipulated to fulfill his needs, nature is no more an object of astonishment but an object to subjugation. Heidegger returns to the meaning of *essence* in order to define the position and role of technology and clarifies that modern technology is in quest to *expose* the truth rather than *revealing it in a gradual mode*. The revolutionary and accelerated pace of technology is in contrast with theory of nature and it is undermining the social balance (Borgmann, 2005). This accelerated pace of technology is *challenging* and by challenging Heidegger wants to position technology as demanding and stimulating; man requires nature to produce more energy to parallel his accelerating needs, mining is another facet of this challenge as man wants earth to reveal what is inside (in the form of coals and other minerals). In simplest sense, man considers nature as a source to address his demands and nature is being manipulated rather than being respected (Heidegger, 1977).

Modern technological paradox has altered the socio-cultural foundations and now, cultural values are undertaken as more *physical and material* rather than *metaphysical and original*. Different cultures round the globe are passing through the most difficult phase of their existence; the role of commercial organization with most modern technology and transhumanistic approach have transformed the natural framework of cultural evolution and artificial intelligence has left no room for humans to be human anymore. The tussle between social and commercial organization has gone par limits and unfortunately commercial organizations have taken over social organization; in return, nothing is being offered to society except a shaky, ambiguous and inconsistent life cycle. In forthcoming section, we discuss some of these core back drops in perspective of modern technology.

Social Organization vs Commercial (Transhumanistic) Organization

Social organizations are the first and foremost collective exhibition of culture of any society as they depict a consolidate pattern of relationship between individuals and different social groups (Campbell, 2010). These relationships are outcome of *a shared sense of affiliation*, that is natural among every organic race and humans are no exception. These organizations are based upon shared beliefs, acceptance, tolerance, values, affiliation, collective resources, clear sense of purpose, well defined objectives, vibrant span of control and strong bonded relationships (Ahrne, 1994). The most notable factor in these organizations is that they change constantly by the passage of time and incorporate rapidly changing social requirements in order to serve their real purpose and appear beneficial for society (Sutton, 2003), they evolve and re-generate their systems in a harmonized and consistent fashion while keeping all stakeholders on board; educational institutions, social clubs, religious organizations, welfare organizations, sports teams, NGOs etc. are some of the known faces of social organizations.

Social organizations evolve by time and incorporate rapidly changing requirements of society in which they exist. *What are these rapidly changing requirements*? Evolution of societies is similar as natural evolution; societies progress in small phases (Smith, 2010) and their gradual progression is dependent upon the changing needs of the individuals and groups. These changing needs are derived through many (internal/external) factors; these factors are natural and they impress social organization and initiate qualitative changes in these organizations. It is evident that socio-cultural evolution takes place in natural surroundings and complexities of social web gives way to these changes and they are addressed keeping in view the social order of a society; social development primarily focus the *nature, institutions, relations and behaviors* in a society and transform social organization to counter novel needs of society (Korotayev, 2004).

Small and large scale commercial organizations are emerging rapidly and enveloping entire world under the slogan of *globalization*. Considerable and dominant scientific inventions and innovations provide plentiful openings to these organizations to translate their respective agenda with an *objective sense*. Corporate culture is a clear and simple reflection of the top management's visions, values and primacies (Coleman, 2013); it is not only the culture of an organization but the core personality that depicts the ways an organization carries itself forward on the progressive track. The top stalwarts of an organization gain extensive insight from the society in which they operate and in order to establish lasting foundation for their organization, they follow the same cultural track that are offered by society. Organization and society are required to complement one another in a natural, balanced and workable mode. Current day organizations are so overwhelmed by technological interfaces that this balance seems shattered (Szell, 2015). A new generation of tired, bored, dry and lethargic corporate executives under the heavy impression of laptops, mobiles, tablets, and other gadgets are striving to maintain this balance but they are all uncertain *on how to carry themselves?* They are turning out to be a *new human* who believe in *perfection, achievement and independence*.

It is so strange that birth of this new technology-coated culture is seemingly a wed lock between man and machine. An average human passes active time of his/her life away from home; mostly at work. He/she passes through a continuous phase of *personal transformation,* by every passing day an individual moves forward in his professional span of life and experience rapid automation in the name of efficiency, progress, success and technological singularity (Morris, 2015). Human-human interaction is evaporating and human-technology interface is rapidly growing on fast track. Humans are being pushed by modern evolving technology onslaught to adapt this new environment as it is in their own interest. If they do not adapt then they will be less human and left far behind from their very own genetic race. It is a painful situation to push a human to learn more and more keeping consistent objectives in his mind and need to change (body, mind, behavior, priorities and social affiliations etc.) (Gullens, 2015). Natural process of personal change is slow and gradual rather technology changes rapid and radical; human needs to go abnormal in order to cope and be compatible with technology, this accelerated bond between man and technology impresses all aspect of life.

A New Culture in making: Accelerated Derivatives with daunting outcomes

The wheel has turned around and now technology ridden organizations have overpowered the cycle of social progression and a new culture is being imposed on societies with leaving no chance for humans except to accept this new narrative that is meant to accelerate the pace of natural growth by applying artificial means and implanting technologically coated interfaces replacing natural intelligence with an artificial one. Some of the core variables of this transhumanistic culture are being discussed below, just an eye opener or teasers for other researchers to come forward and look for other related dimensions.

Communicative Competence or Individual Isolation

Corporate communication is twofold as employees communicate internally with one another and externally with customers (especially, the mode of customer communication has become 24/7/365). The significance and impact of effective corporate communication cannot be undermined and it is the area that seems most influenced by *user-friendly technology* (telephone, internet, intranet, social media, e-mails, blogs, web portals, on-line e-commerce initiatives etc.). People are not talking to one another personally, even while being at their work stations, they are used to communicate through extensions and intranets. Corporate communication is under the heavy burden of technological obsession; it is objective, perfect, time bound and result driven. In past, employees talk to one another in person; tea, lunch and other breaks provided sufficient opportunity to everyone to interact freely with everyone. Inter-personal communications improved relationships, human understanding, tolerance, compassions and forgiveness (Harper, 2015). On the contrary, technology driven communication leaves no room to gain these advantages as most of the people have primarily lost the rewarding experience of personal human interaction, they have learnt the *art of disguise* as being online saves one from facing other one in-person, they go casual in their communications as the benefit of hiding behind on-

line messages, they have developed illusionary relationships and virtual connection as they become more isolated in and outside of their workplace (Ramey, 2013), they have become less tolerant and less adaptive as communicating through technology is a one-way activity which does not require understanding diverse behaviors, surroundings, changing environment and effort to tolerate the un-tolerable and accept the changes.

The *subjective mode of communication* is no more a relevant topic as now we are communicating for something and because of something (every call and every click costs) the sense of accomplishment, achievement and accountability is there. Organizations are throwing out these well qualified mechanistic and robotic individuals; most of whom are the heads of their families being closely followed by their spouses, kids and siblings. Younger lot idealize these executives and try to copy their styles, communication style is the first to be copied; slowly but gradually, the social web of communication has lost its charm and now communication is an objective activity. There must be a topic, subject, goal, vision, mission of any call and click. Humans are digitally connected and socially isolated. The most unfortunate part of this story is that billions of dollars are being spent on touching new heights in the field of communication so that a simple smart phone can be a replacement for entire family.

A constant connection with this virtual world leaves less room for our bonding with the real world, smart communication technology is distracting us from our real world relationships and increasing the level of anxiety towards objective communication that leads us to be informed with every bell rings (Rosen, 2015). Studies show that human body kinesthetic in prime physical shape directs a human to copy and carry the same style during odd and relaxed hours with less objectivity; working executive return back home with a sense to be in touch while keeping themselves at a distance, more and more people find themselves sensing distant and out of touch (Warrell, 2012).

Technological Automation or Alienation

There is a vital, vivid and clear relationship between alienation and technology as they both are directly proportional to one another. *Alienation*, in its social perspective, can be defined as a permanent feeling of purposelessness, hopelessness and disaffection. Self-alienation is primary outcome of being a mechanistic part of a social totality (Fulcher, 2003). Automation of manual labor further aggravate the situation pertaining to alienation; since the very beginning of industrialization, this problem persists. It accelerated when manual handicraft economy replaced by mechanistic manufacturing economy. Marx considers a strong relationship between *work* and *worker* as people express themselves through their creativity, innovation and skill (Fulcher, 2003). Manual labor provides a sense of control and accomplishment to the worker, in contrast, technological advancement has snatched this sense of control and workers are being pushed to follow instruction needed to be understood to operate machines, timings, inputs and outputs. It further takes away the sense of happiness as workers are producing something that is not for them but eventually generating immense wealth for their employers. A sharp sense of

estrangement witnessed between workers and employers and mutual collaboration, contribution was replaced with competition and target achievement (Kellner, 2006); every new technological initiative leaving human less valuable and disempowered, the prime focus of transhumanism is to increase human efficiency through injecting modern technology but the accelerated extent of this technological interference has replaced many manual productive interfaces with automated ones (Lawson, 2001).

It has been closely observed that the notion of alienation seems stronger in jobs with less human autonomy, it is a proven fact that technology not only enhances productive efficiency but also provide ample chances for outsourcing (Shantza, 2012); increasing demands of goods and rapidly growing world population are the core factors for fast track industrialization but fragmentation of skilled jobs, disintegration of professional balance, degeneration of core human skills and income disparity are the associated outcomes that further strengthening the notion of social alienation. The relationship between technology and alienation is reshaping human identity and giving way to a new form of social relations (Daniel, 1976), trans-humanization influences human life in number of ways and the most prominent one is *snatching human identity*.

It is not astonishing that people from all walks of life have developed sharp sense of hope, fear, curiosity, anxiety and fantasies with uprising technologies and through radio, television and other electronic media wagons, they are constantly being pursued to give way to these technologies in their daily lives (Downing, 2001). The proponents of IT and ICT have thronged our societies with success stories of novel technologies. The cultural paradigm seems more focused upon achieving something through these gadgets and it diverts human approach towards life and accelerates *individual alienation.* These technologies are giving new dimensions to human subjectivity, social relations, aesthetics and art (Castells, 1996). In fact production technologies take human into the realm of *hyper-reality* and he feels himself isolated without these technological patronage. The intrinsic sense of creation, innovation and craftsmanship dies on the way and a healthy living human turns out to be a mere operator of a modest, latest machine that eliminates his identity and leaves him nowhere.

The critical theory of technology (Feenberg, 1991) manifests the advantages of technology and claims *technological utopia* that latest machines and computers will ease human life and take human to an advanced level of social reality; but it does not exhibits that these machineries and computers are evenly carries of alienation that distorts human creativity and multi-dimensional thinking. In fact, technology has become a tool in the hands of capitalists and being used to ensure domination and power over all societal quarters in the name of productivity and growth. The dialectical theory justifies the position of technology in all societies and mentions that technology and society evolve together over time, but, the core problem is that technological evolution rejects the normative compendium of society and tries to accelerate the pace of social evolution that eventually collides with natural evolution and pushes man to run instead to walk

(Bill, 2000). This accelerated pace further strengthens the notion of physical weakness in humans and finally they feel estranged and alienated in the hands of their own inventions.

Robotics and Relational Distortion

Organizations round the globe are using robots in order to improve their operational efficiency; humans at work are supposed to develop relations with these robots as they establish relations with other humans. This human-machine interaction derives new dimensions in human-human interaction (Nourbaksh, 2003). Human response to non-human objects and consider themselves as their partner influence their *emotional attachment* with other humans (Kerepsi, 2006); not to end here, but this artificial sense of relationship leaves lasting impact on social environment and humans start expecting same emotional behavior from other humans.

In addition to it, rapid induction of robots in manufacturing industry has posed many questions on human employment opportunities and all social quarters are concerned with this increasing displacement of humans; it generates, employment insecurity and social imbalance. If a large number of humans go jobless then who will be held responsible for their health, education and other related matters; state will not be able to dispense its responsibilities towards its citizens and it derive towards a state-society conflict (West, 2015).

Another question raises here is the *work-life balance*, if robots take over most of the human job then quality time spending for human would be a big question, we need to look for other way of healthy and contended living. Human isolation from work directly impacts social relationships and quality of relationship; economic in-equality adds more fuel to fire and ascertain the possibility that there would be more robots in future as they perform with less cost and deliver cost-effective productions (Karstan, 2015).

Human-robot interaction displays a new kind of relationship as in this interface *perfection* plays a vital role. Human on the one end and robot on the other are in a constant and lasting relationship; robot is in firm condition to act as a perfect partner without demanding anything in return and obeys every command from his human counterpart on the other end, it seemingly replicates complex social interaction (Dautenhahn, 2007). This association does not suit the natural-social relationship where both the partners are human; further, it accelerates the possibility of imbalance and eventually causes disruption in social circle as demands from one end cannot be met in a robotic manner. This human-robot interaction has posed many challenges to the nature of interaction and social behavior and researches are underway to look into the viable replacement of *human cognitive ability* through these robots and it is for sure that it would create a new lag between human-human interactions, replacing VAK (video, auditory and kinesthetic) ability of human and planted it into robots reveals the possibility of entering into a socio-robotic culture and damage prevailing social circle (Steinfeld, 2006).

Conclusion

Our prime intention in this paper is to invite other researchers, practitioners, social philosophers and people from academia to divert their attention towards this rapid cultural shift. The evolutionary relationship between man and nature is being distorted by modern technology and the pace of this distortion is accelerated by every passing day. Generations to come are going to face a world that would be far different from the prevailing one. Trans-humanization has thronged cultural norms and social framework and technological singularity is dominating all walks of life. Humanization is losing its ground and most of the time we are talking technology; one after another, our behavioral norms are even impressed by modern technology.

There is a sharp and widening lag between generations and technology which is facilitating this un-natural difference between father and son and mother and daughter. Humans are becoming obsoleted as they are not well versed with modern technological gadgets and centuries old cultural norms are being tagged as *primitive* because of artificial technological onslaught. The phenomena of success and progress is an illusion for entire mankind. Technology generates a disease and technology provides its remedy. Gone are the days, when human was more involved with other humans and people used to share themselves with others. The physical presence of one person for another person meant a lot and there was a strong social interactive culture in our societies. The fast paced technology coated culture has taken away the serene and beauty of life and we are short of time to give to other human and seem more involved with modern equipment.

Human development cannot be ascertained by any external source, as technology; it is not transhumanism that takes a man to be a *superhuman* rather it is transcendence that transforms a man into a *superhuman* with extraordinary abilities, skills and competence. Human needs to travel within themselves than to far away from themselves. The core of human evolution should be *centripetal* instead of *centrifugal*.

References

Ahrne, G. (1994). Social Organizations: Interaction Inside, Outside, and Between Organizations. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Allias, L. (2003). Kant's transcendental idealism and contemporary anti-realism. *International Journal of Philosophical Studies, 11*, 369-392.

Arthur, W. Brian. (2009). The Nature of Technology: What it is and How it is. New York: Free Press.

Bainbridge, W. S. (2005). The Transhuman Heresy. Journal of Evolution and Technology, 14(2), 1-10.

Bill, J. (2000). Why the Future Doesn't Need Us. Wired, 8(7), 238-246.

Borgmann, A. (2005). "Technology," A Companion to Heidegger Ed. Dreyfus and Wrathall. London: Blackwell Publishing.

Campbell, J. C. (2010). Family Violence and Nursing Practice, Second Edition (J. Humphreys, Ed.). NY: Springer Publishing Company.

Carvalko, J. (2012). The techno-human shell: a jump in the evolutionary gap. Mechanicsburg, PA: Sunbury Press.

Castells, M. (1996). The Rise of the Network Society. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Clark, H., & Taplin, D. (2012). Theory of Change Basics: A Primer on Theory of Change. New York: Actknowledge.

Coleman, J. (2013, May 06). Six Components of a Great Corporate Culture. Retrieved June 07, 2017, from https://hbr.org/2013/05/six-components-of-culture

Das, Ajit, K. (1993). The Dialectical Humanism of Erich Fromm. The Journal of Humanistic Counseling, (32) 2, 50-60

Daniel, B. (1976). The Coming of Post-Industrial Society. New York: Basic Book.

Dautenhahn, K. (2007). Socially intelligent robots: dimensions of human–robot interaction. Biological Sciences, 679-704.

Downing, J. (2001). Radical Media. London: Sage.

Feenberg, A. (2010). Ten Paradoxes of Technology. Techne, 14(1), 3-15.

Ferrando, F. (2014). The Body. In Post- and Transhumanism: an Introduction. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Feenberg, A. (1991). Critical Theory of Technology. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fulcher, J., & Scott, J. (2003). Sociology. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goodman, C. (2009). Consequences of Compassion: An interpretation and Defense of Buddhist Ethics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gullens, S. (2015, November 13). To be Human is to adapt. Retrieved June 08, 2017, from http://www.gereports.com/debate/debate-is-technology-making-us-less-human/

Habibi, D. (2001). John Stuart Mill and the Ethic of Human Growth. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Harper, M. N. (2015, August 13). The Disadvantages of Technology in the Workplace. Retrieved June 08, 2017, from http://smallbusiness.chron.com/disadvantages-technology-workplace-20157.html

Heidegger, M. (1977). The Question Concerning Technology," Basic Writings Ed. David Farrell Krell. New York: Harper & Row.

Huxley, J. (1957). New Bottles For New Wine. London: Chatto & Windus.

Karstan, J., & West, D. M. (2015, October 26). How robots, artificial intelligence, and machine learning will affect employment and public policy. Retrieved July 04, 2017, from https://www.brookings.edu

Kellner, D. (2006). New Technologies and Alienation: Some Critical Reflections.The evolution of alienation: Trauma, promise, and the millennium, Langman, L., & Kalekin-Fishman, D. (Eds). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kerepesi, A., E, J., Magnusson, G., & Miklosi, M. (2006). Behavioural comparison of human–animal (dog) and human–robot (AIBO) interactions. Behav Process, 73, 92-99.

Kiran, A. H., & Verbeek, P. P. (2010). Trusting Our Selves to Technology. Knowledge, Technology and Policy, 23(3-4), 409-427.

Korotayev, A. (2004). World Religions and Social Evolution of the Old World Oikumene Civilizations: A Cross-cultural Perspective (First ed.). Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.

Lanier, J. (2013). Who Owns the Future? New York: Simon & Schuster.

Lawson , T., & Garrod, J. (2001). Deskilling. Dictionary of Sociology. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn .

Macionis, G., & John, L. (2010). Sociology 7th Canadian Ed. Toronto, Ontario: Pearson Canada Inc.

Mezick , D. (2012, November 25). Organizational Transhumanism. Retrieved May 25, 2017, from http://newtechusa.net/agile/organizational-transhumanism/

Mercer, C., & Thorton, T. J., eds. (2014). Religion and Transhumanism: The Unknown Future of Human Enhancement. Praeger

More, M. (1990). Transhumanism: Towards a Futurist Philosophy. *Extropy, 6*, 6-12

Morris, C. (2015, August 15). Is technology killing the human touch? Retrieved June 08, 2017, from http://www.cnbc.com/2015/08/15/gy-killing-the-human-touch.html

Nordhaus, W.D., (2007). Two Centuries of Productivity Growth in Computing. . The Journal of Economic History, 67(1), 128-159.

Nourbaksh, F. T., & Kerstin, I. D. (2003). A survey of socially interactive robots. Robot Auton Syst, 43, 143-166.

Ogburn, W. F. (1966). Social Change. New York: Dell.

Ramey, Y. (2013, February 25). The advantages and disadvantages of technology in the work place. Retrieved June 08, 2017, from http://www.useoftechnology.com/technology-workplace-2/

Rosen, L. (2015, May 10). *YES: Connecting Virtually Isn't Like Real-World Bonding*. Retrieved June 19, 2017, from https://www.wsj.com/articles/is-technology-making-people-less-sociable-1431093491

Shantza , A., Alfes, K., & Truss, K. (2012). Alienation from work: Marxist ideologies and twenty-first-century practice. The International Journal of Human Resource Management , 25(18), 2529-2550

Spencer, H. (1852). A Theory of Population, Deduced from the General Law of Human Fertility. Westminster Review, 57, 468-501.

Smith, K. (2010, October 13). Societies evolve in steps. Retrieved May 29, 2017, doi:10.1038/news.2010.537

Stark, R. (2007). *Sociology: Tenth Edition*. Belmon, CA: Thomson Learning, Inc.

Stevenson, M. K. (2012). *Empirical Analysis of the American Transcendental movement*. New York: Penguin.

Steinfeld, A. M. et al. (2006). Common metrics for human–robot interaction. In Proc. 2006 Human–Robot Interaction Conference, New York, 33-40.

Sutton, J. R. (2003). Research in the Sociology of Organizations, vol. 19: Social Structure and Organizations Revisited. Administrative Science Quarterly, 48(4), 715-717.

Szell, T. (2015, January 15). The Influence of Technology on Culture. Retrieved June 07, 2017, from http://www.balanceinteractive.com/blog/influence-technology-culture

Waddington, D. (2005). A Field Guide to Heidegger Understanding The Question Concerning Technology. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 37(4).

Warrell, M. (2012, May 24). *Text or Talk: Is Technology Making You Lonely?* Retrieved June 19, 2017, from https://www.forbes.com/sites/womensmedia/2012/05/24/text-or-talk-is-technology-making-you-lonely/#53b246522a7b

West, D. M. (2015, October 06). What happens if robots take the jobs? The impact of emerging technologies on employment and public policy. Retrieved July 04, 2017, from https://www.brookings.edu/research/what-happens-if-robots-take-the-jobs-the-impact-of-emerging-technologies-on-employment-and-public-policy/

Williams, R. (1983). *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press.